

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Tuesday, April 11, 1989

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we are thankful that Your love to us is not dependent on our perfect thoughts or deeds, but rather flows to us in unmerited favor in new and marvelous ways each day. Though we may respond to Your love with deeds of justice and compassion and ever seek to be faithful to Your gifts to us, we are, above all else, grateful that Your love is upon us filling us with forgiveness, with mercy, with strength and purpose. Though we may depart from You, O God, may Your love never depart from us. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] kindly lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

Mr. SMITH of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## IN COMMENDATION OF M. SGT. ED GARCIA

(Mr. ENGLISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a special man, a man whose selflessness and generosity reflect what is best about the American spirit.

The man I speak of is Air Force Senior M. Sgt. Apolonio (Ed) Garcia, a resident of Enid, OK, and today a proud recipient of the President's 1989 Volunteer Action Award. Earlier today, Sergeant Garcia and 17 other dedicated Americans were personally presented with this prestigious award by President Bush at a White House ceremony.

The Sixth District of Oklahoma is very well served by Sergeant Garcia's example. He was chosen for this honor on the basis of his outstanding work in the Hispanic community in Enid, as-

sisting immigrants in adapting to what can be a difficult environment. In addition to tutoring new arrivals as to how to obtain residency permits, Sergeant Garcia has spent countless hours cooking for soup kitchens, pitching in on food drives, and teaching both English and English as a second language to area residents.

The sum of Ed Garcia's work exemplifies the power of voluntarism. In giving of himself, Sergeant Garcia has spread good far beyond the limits of his own life. I commend him to my colleagues in the House, and congratulate him on the recognition bestowed by President Bush today.

## INTRODUCTION OF COAST GUARD LICENSE VERIFICATION ACT

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, just think about this: Captain Hazelwood was allowed to drive the *Exxon Valdez* through Prince William Sound, while, at the very same time, he was forbidden to drive his car down the road.

New York State had suspended his driver's license three times for driving under the influence. But the Coast Guard didn't know that.

I am introducing a bill to help the Coast Guard determine whether masters, mates, engineers, and pilots serving on commercial vessels have any history of driving under the influence. My bill, the Coast Guard License Verification Act, will authorize the Coast Guard to access the National Driver Register, and run a simple check of the driving records of those officers whenever they apply for or renew their Coast Guard licenses.

The Coast Guard currently has no easy way to check an applicant's assertion that he has had no D.U.I.'s.

My bill makes verification simple, and does not rely solely on the word of the applicant. The concept, to borrow a phrase from Ronald Reagan, is "trust, but verify." That just might be enough to prevent another *Valdez*.

## INSURANCE INDUSTRY DECISION A POSITIVE ONE

(Mr. GLICKMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the insurance industry announced an important decision: The

Insurance Services Office, or ISO, which is the industry's data-gathering and ratemaking body, will no longer provide advisory rates to its 1,400 participating insurance companies.

The advisory rate is a suggested final price which includes expenses, overhead, litigation costs, and profit. This means that for the first time in many years insurance companies will have to set their final rates on the basis of their own figures, rather than relying, in whole or in part, on a final rate set by an industrywide rating organization. While the industry will still receive historical loss information and trending data from the ISO, this step will hopefully help to increase competition for rates in all lines of insurance around this country, particularly automobile and homeowner policies.

In the coming months Congress should scrutinize the effects of ISO decisions on individual insurance companies, State regulatory agencies and the consumer, in advance of considering modification to the McCarran-Ferguson Act antitrust statute which exempts insurance companies from many of its provisions.

I am concerned about legislating rapid and dramatic change in an industry that insures the financial stability of the individual consumer and the entire economy. The industry step I have talked about by the ISO is a positive one and Congress should continue to maintain its vigorous oversight over this issue as the ISO decision is implemented.

## HCFA REGULATIONS ARE HARMING HOME CARE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, as a county commissioner, I worked with the Catawba County Health Department to initiate our community's home care program. Since that time, I have followed the development of this service with considerable interest.

Home health care is the most affordable, practical alternative to institutional care that not only gives patients and their families greater control over their lives, but it also helps to strengthen the family's sense of personal responsibility for their loved ones. It is a service that I support and should be available for everyone.

Home health care agencies now must comply with reams of Federal regula-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

tions from the Health Care Financing Administration which is making the cost of medical care go up faster and higher every day.

Can you imagine spending every day filling out paperwork like this to meet Federal mandates? This is paperwork for one patient for 1 month.

HCFA get off our backs and let home health care grow.

**NOTICE OF FILING OF COMPLAINT WITH COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL STANDARDS OF CONDUCT AGAINST THE HONORABLE NEWT GINGRICH**

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, before the Easter recess several Members were troubled about reports of misconduct by one of our Members and colleagues of this body to whom interrogatories were submitted to explore the allegations of misconduct reported in the press.

No response to date has been filed, and I announce to the Members that today I have filed a complaint with the Committee on Official Standards of Conduct in the House of Representatives against the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

**MAKING IN ORDER ON APRIL 12, 1989, NOT MORE THAN 8 HOURS OF DEBATE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 165, DISAPPROVING RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE, AND MAKING IN ORDER ON APRIL 18, 1989, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, 2 ADDITIONAL HOURS OF DEBATE**

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of the order of the House of March 21, 1989, and of Public Law 100-526 to the contrary, the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 165) disapproving the recommendations of the Commission of Base Realignment and Closure shall be governed by the following order:

First, it shall be in order on Wednesday, April 12, 1989, to move pursuant to section 208(d) of Public Law 100-526 to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Second, on Wednesday, April 12, 1989, not more than 8 hours of debate on the resolution, equally divided and controlled by those favoring and those opposed, shall be in order. After completion of such debate the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union shall rise and no further consideration of the resolution shall be in order before April 18, 1989.

Third, on Tuesday, April 18, 1989, or any day thereafter, the Speaker may declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the resolution in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 100-526, except that during such further consideration not more than 2 hours of debate, equally divided and controlled by those favoring the resolution and those opposed, shall be in order.

□ 1210

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is not my intention to object, because I think it is probably the most reasonable approach to the use of the 10 hours.

Let me just, for clarification though, ask my chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN]: As to the allocation of time, there will be half and half, opponents and proponents, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman, intends to control the time for those who are opposed to the resolution for disapproval. There are those of us on this side who would like to be heard, and I would wonder if our chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, would share with us his intentions as to the allocation of his time, and then who does the chairman anticipate would represent those speaking for the resolution and how that might be handled?

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the reason for this request is to alter the arrangement made in a previous unanimous-consent agreement.

It now appears, because of several scheduling difficulties, that we would be unable to finish consideration of the base closure resolution of disapproval next week as planned if we start on Tuesday. The delay in consideration of the resolution would not permit enough time for both the Senate and the President to act in order to meet the May 1 deadline if the decision is to approve the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, after consideration on both sides, I would like to have the House do a substantial part of the general debate tomorrow and leave 2 hours of general debate and the vote for next Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the chairman on this side that we would divide the time, and one-half would go to the proponents of the amendment. The ranking member on the Republican side, I would anticipate, would then be the gentleman

from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER]. On our side it would be my intention to divide the time with the gentleman from Alabama for the opponents of the resolution.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say that since the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] is the ranking member on the Military Construction Subcommittee, I would suggest that he would be the one to share the time instead of this gentleman from Alabama, if that would be agreeable with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, that would certainly be agreeable. I do not believe that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] is in the Chamber at the present time.

I would like to take the opportunity to say that this extraordinary piece of legislation, and even the rule for which was written in the public law last year, that everyone who is a proponent of the resolution, that we have bent over backwards, and I think we have accommodated them at every turn and will continue to do so. It is my understanding that I will be having the control of the time for that share of the time on this side of the aisle in opposition to the resolution, and I think we can work that out.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, that suits us over here fine. It would be our intention then to yield, out of our 4 hours on Wednesday, we would yield 2 of those hours to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], and then on the following Tuesday, when we consider the resolution for 2 hours before voting on it, again, we would divide the time between the proponents and the opponents, and the hour that would be given for the opponents of the resolution I would then propose yielding another half hour of that to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKINSON. Reclaiming my time, I understand it, and it is certainly acceptable to us if it is acceptable to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is acceptable.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], who had some questions that he wanted to propound to either me or the chairman.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.



Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to discuss with the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, a matter that I think is of urgent concern with regard to the upcoming debate and the vote. Some time ago I introduced a bill which is known as H.R. 1108 which would postpone, if it were enacted, the date of a vote until the GAO had time to complete its study, and I have indicated my flexibility as to a date certain somewhere down the road that would give the GAO an opportunity to complete its study for the most part and get back to us.

The reason I rise this morning is because new information has come to my attention in the last 24 hours that supports the contention of many of us who think this committee report is wrong, that it is flawed. We have several things that have been disclosed to us. One is an Army audit report which we all know about that indicates that certain things ought to be done, and the Commission did pretty much the opposite. We know that the Commission said that it was going to cost \$X number of dollars to do something. We know the Army said it is going to cost millions of dollars more to do what the Commission suggested, but last night about 4:30 or 5 o'clock Senator LAUTENBERG from the other House disclosed that the GAO had sent testimony to the other House to the effect that the ranking of tradeoff facilities had been in error and that Fort Dix had originally been ranked, pursuant to certain ranking points, as No. 7 out of 8, giving it a very low military usefulness ranking. The GAO further said yesterday in its testimony which will be given tomorrow morning at 9:30 that Fort Dix has the highest ranking when the mistakes that were made by the Commission or by the Army or by whoever it was are completed and straightened out.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a military facility which ranks No. 1 out of all of those studies in terms of its military usefulness which is on this list which I suggest to the chairman gives us good reason to try to find a way to wait until the GAO concludes their study, because this is very, I believe, vital information, and I am sure that the gentleman agrees with me that if a mistake was made by the Commission we ought to have ample evidence to view those mistakes and those errors before we vote on this bill.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman should know that we have done everything that we could to try and make as much information available to everybody under this provision as we could have possibly done. The gentleman knows that the bill that

was passed by an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress established the timetable that we are operating under. The GAO knew the timetable from the beginning. The opponents and proponents of the measure knew the timetable from the beginning, and we are now operating under that timetable.

We are delaying the vote on the issue as long as we can consistent with giving both Houses ample time to consider the resolution of disapproval and the President time to sign it. The date at which the 45 days expires under the resolution by which Congress has to act ends on May 1. We need to have a vote in the House enough before May 1 so that the bill can go to the Senate, also be voted on in the Senate, and then go to the President and be signed by the President.

It is not that we do not understand the problem that the gentleman from New Jersey is raising here, but the gentleman should know that we are doing everything we can to accommodate him and the gentleman's arguments about the rankings of Fort Dix. We have, as the gentleman knows, 10 hours of debate, 8 of them this week, 2 hours next week, and he will have an ample time to make his points, to make his case, but I do think that the legislation ought to be continued as the timetable set out. It was known by everybody when we voted on it. We voted on it overwhelmingly in favor of it.

The information that we are providing by the GAO, I would point out to the gentleman from New Jersey, is gratuitous. The requirement of the law says nothing about providing all of this information to the people. We are doing it because we want to help the people who are being affected by the base closure. We are trying to make sure all the information is available, that the debate can be taken in a free and open manner, but I think, to respond directly to the gentleman's question, the idea of delaying the vote would be a very, very bad idea at this time.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would say that I am certainly in sympathy with the gentleman's problem. As the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has said, if under the gentleman's resolution that he has introduced, if it should pass, it would come late. We do not have to vote in the House. We are bringing it to a vote to give everybody an opportunity. If we do not act, it goes into effect automatically, so the gentleman would be late with that.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that if the gentleman is correct in saying that due to error and misunderstanding that Fort Dix was erroneously included, this Member, at least, and I am sure I speak for the entire committee,

would do whatever we could to accommodate the gentleman and the New Jersey delegation to see that whatever legislative remedies are available would be put into effect to make sure that the error is corrected.

□ 1220

I do not know how to do it. We cannot disarrange the entire vehicle to accommodate one instance, and as the cliché goes, we do not want to throw out the baby with the bath water.

But if in fact the gentleman from New Jersey and others from New Jersey can convince us and be persuasive that this was a gross error, we will work in any way possible to correct it with whatever legislation it takes.

I am glad to yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the attitude of the chairman and the ranking Member on this. I would just say again that there is an opportunity I believe to amend this law by passing another bill. We could pass the bill this week. The Senate could pass it the following week, and the President could have it to sign, which would delay the vote.

Mr. DICKINSON. That would be a little speedy.

Mr. SAXTON. It might be a little speedy for the Congress to get around to do things that quickly, I agree. But it still does not mean that it is possible to do, particularly given the fact that the GAO apparently yesterday about 4 o'clock or 4:30 made information available to us that said that we, the GAO, are saying the commission made a very dramatic mistake in their ranking of TRADOC bases. I think that at least we ought to have an opportunity to know all of those details.

I might point out one further thing, and that is this is not the only mistake that I am sure the commission has made. This is just one of 145 bases that was studied and happens to be the only one I have studied, and I have found a lot of things wrong with the study. I tried to do it objectively. So in any event, I am just here to appeal for perhaps some consideration to whatever mechanism may be necessary to delay this vote to give us an opportunity to get full benefit of the GAO report.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman. I can only reiterate what I said. If it is made patent that there has been a gross error in the information given to the commission, and if they have acted based on information which is not correct, and I am sure I speak for the chairman, and I know I speak for our side of the aisle, we will do whatever we can, as expeditiously as possible to minimize the damage and cut the losses, and try to rectify whatever wrong was done.

But that is not to say I would support killing the entire bill when there are 140-odd bases involved, and we are talking about one here.

Mr. Speaker, if no one else wants to speak, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1989

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 12, 1989.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS AND COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 1750, IMPLEMENTING THE BIPARTISAN ACCORD ON CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs have until midnight tonight, Tuesday, April 11, 1989, to file reports on the bill H.R. 1750, to implement the bipartisan accord on Central America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, April 12, 1989.

#### CONVEYING LAND IN VIRGINIA FOR USE AS A VETERANS NURSING HOME

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 310) to remove a restriction from a parcel of land in Roanoke, VA, in order for that land to be conveyed to the State of Virginia for use as a veterans nursing home.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 310

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REMOVAL RESTRICTION.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 2, the Secretary of the Interior shall execute such instruments as may be necessary to remove the restriction that the parcel of land described in subsection (b) be used exclusively for public park or public recreation purposes in perpetuity on the condition that the city of Roanoke, Virginia, transfer such land to the State of Virginia for use as a veterans nursing home.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The parcel of land referred to in subsection (a) is that parcel known as Veterans Park which is comprised of approximately 16.8 acres and was conveyed to the city of Roanoke, Virginia, by the United States on June 25, 1980 (recorded in the city of Roanoke Deed Book 1455, page 1154).

#### SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON REMOVAL.

The Secretary of the Interior may not remove the restriction described in section 1(a) if, within 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the State of Virginia has not committed funds with respect to the parcel described in section 1(b) in an amount sufficient—

(1) to comply with the State's obligation under section 5035 of title 38, United States Code (relating to applications with respect to projects; payments); or

(2) to construct, without a Federal grant, a veterans nursing home.

#### SEC. 3. REVERSION.

If, after the removal of the restriction described in section 1(a), the parcel referred to in section 1(b) ceases to be used for the purposes of a veterans nursing home, the parcel shall revert to the United States.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 310 is a bill introduced by Representatives OLIN and PAYNE of Virginia.

It deals with a tract of about 16.8 acres of land located next to an existing hospital facility near Salem, VA. Originally, this land was under the control of the Veterans' Administration, which still retains the hospital site.

In 1980 the surface estate in this tract next to the hospital was transferred by the United States to the city of Roanoke, VA, for park and recreational purposes, subject to reversion to Federal ownership if used for any other purpose.

Since then, the city has not developed any park or recreational facilities on the land. The city evidently has ample parks and open space areas, and does not believe this tract is needed for that purpose. Instead, the city would like to be able to transfer the land to the Commonwealth of Virginia for use as the site of a veterans' nursing home. The land has been identified as the desirable site for the nurs-

ing home because of its location next to the existing hospital.

At our hearing, we were told that the Virginia Veterans' Department is actively pursuing establishment of a veterans' nursing home, which probably would be named for our late colleague from Virginia, Dan Daniel. This bill is intended to facilitate that by making this land available for that purpose.

Under the bill, the Secretary of the Interior could allow the transfer from city to State ownership to occur, if the State acts within 4 years to commit the funds necessary to establish the nursing home. After such a transfer the State's ownership would be limited—first, because the minerals would remain in Federal ownership; second, because existing easements and rights-of-way would remain in effect; and third, because the land would be subject to reversion to the United States if used for any purpose other than a veterans' nursing home.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill. The proposed new use of the land would not impair recreational and open-space opportunities. The administration testified that they have no objection to the bill's enactment. I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 310 introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OLIN], is a bill we can all support. I think it has the support of the entire Virginia delegation including Mr. PARRIS, a member of the Interior Committee.

As the subcommittee chairman has mentioned, the bill allows the State of Virginia to build a veterans hospital on the site that was originally transferred to the city of Roanoke, VA, for recreation purposes. In short, this legislation allows the city of Roanoke to transfer the site to the State for a veterans hospital.

The Federal Government is still fully protected because if the State does not use the land for a veterans hospital it would revert back to the Federal Government.

This is a good bill and I recommend its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OLIN].

Mr. OLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 310. This bill would allow the city of Roanoke to transfer ownership of a tract of land to the State of Virginia so that Virginia could build a veterans nursing home.

Virginia, like other States, has an aging veteran population. Many veter-



ans need nursing care, but don't need to be in a hospital. A nursing home for these people would provide a place for them to get the care they need. In the past few years, Virginians have become more and more aware of the need for such a facility. So the State of Virginia has decided to take advantage of the State veterans home project, a project that combines State and Federal money to provide nursing care to veterans. When Virginia set out to find a place to put the home they found that there was only one site which met the requirements set forth by the Veterans' Administration. A veterans home has to be near a veterans hospital. The Salem VA Medical Center is the only veterans hospital in Virginia that has enough land near it to build a home. This land was originally given to the city of Roanoke for use as a park, but the city never built a park, so now they want to give it to the State for the veterans home.

This project has virtually universal support. The city of Roanoke has passed a resolution asking the State and Federal Governments to do everything possible to get the home built. The State has budgeted \$6.8 million, which is 100 percent of the needed State contribution. H.R. 310 is cosponsored by the whole Virginia delegation and both of Virginia's Senators are sponsoring identical legislation in the Senate.

It is my understanding that, at the request of veterans groups, the State plans to name the home for our late colleague, Dan Daniel.

Because Virginia has already budgeted all the money needed from the State, and because Virginia does not already have a veterans home, Virginia will be very high on the list to get Federal money. The Virginia Department of Veterans' Affairs is working out the details of the construction so that as soon as we have the land, they will be able to get the money and start construction.

□ 1230

Mr. VENTO, Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 310 which I am pleased to have cosponsored.

The purpose of this bill is simple—to provide for the redesignation of a tract of land which the city of Roanoke, VA was to use as a park. To now make it available as the site of the proposed Virginia Veterans Center.

Virginia is one of the few States which does not have a State veterans home. Recently, the Virginia General Assembly, prompted by the action being taken in Congress, provided for its part of the shared financing which will be necessary and application for the Federal share has been filed with the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Virginia's commitment is strong, the need for such a facility in Virginia is great, and the public support has been amply demonstrated.

It is my privilege to have succeeded last June the late Congressman Dan Daniel who served in this body for 19 years. Congressman Daniel was a former National Commander of the American Legion. His support of veterans was well known in this body and around the country. This facility which H.R. 310 makes possible will be named in honor of Dan and will, therefore, be a monument to the things he stood for and the memory of veterans which he espoused.

For these reasons, I hope the bill will be passed now so that we can get moving on a project which is long overdue.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do so because I would like to add that I think it is very appropriate that Dan Daniel's name is going to be put on this facility. He is someone who was near and dear to a lot of us. I think it is a fitting memorial to him.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and to commend all of the members of the subcommittee and full committee who were involved in moving this bill so quickly—Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. YOUNG.

This bill will permit the State of Virginia to join with 36 other States as a participant in the State Veterans Home Program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very successful program. It provides grants to States to assist them in constructing extended-care facilities for our older veterans. The Department of Veterans' Affairs will also provide a per diem payment for each veteran who is cared for in these homes. In 1988, over 24,000 veterans were treated in 55 homes. In contrast to the general decline in availability of health care for older veterans, we've seen a much-needed increase in the number of veterans being cared for in State veterans homes. There is a consensus that this is a worthwhile and cost-effective program.

Mr. Speaker, there is a long list of persons who have worked to make construction of a State veterans home in the Commonwealth of Virginia possible. Gov. Gerald Baliles and the State Department of Veterans Services, the Virginia General Assembly, and our colleagues, JIM OLIN and L.F. PAYNE, all are working to make this home a reality.

The plans call for the nursing home to be built adjacent to the Salem Department of Veterans' Affairs Medical Center. It will have 148 nursing care beds and 76 domiciliary beds. Thousands of Virginians will benefit from its construction, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I have one other observation concerning this legislation. Many years ago, the Veterans' Administration was forced to declare this land excess to the needs of veterans. The land was then conveyed to the city of Roanoke with the restriction that it be used only for

park and recreation purposes. Now, the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the State need the land for a facility to provide care to our aging veterans. This is another example of the shortsightedness of the Federal Government policy which forces agencies to declare as excess property which may be needed in the future. I cannot think of a better example of why we must stop giving away our land. We need it to meet future needs.

I am very pleased to learn that this nursing home when completed will bear the name of Dan Daniel of Virginia, a great veteran, and I certainly support this move.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 310.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 310, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE ADDITION OF CERTAIN PARCELS TO THE HARRY S TRUMAN NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE IN MISSOURI

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 419) to provide for the addition of certain parcels to the Harry S Truman National Historic Site in the State of Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 419

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PROPERTY ACQUISITION.

(a) NOLAND-HAUKENBERRY HOUSE AND WALLACE HOMES.—The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to establish the Harry S Truman National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, and for other purpose", approved May 23, 1983 (97 Stat. 193), is amended—

(1) by striking "That," and inserting "That (a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b)(1) The Secretary is further authorized to acquire by any means set forth in subsection (a) the real properties commonly referred to as—

"(A) the Noland/Haukenberry house and associated lands on Delaware Street in the city of Independence, Missouri, and

"(B) the Frank G. Wallace house and the George P. Wallace house, and associated lands, both on Truman Road in the city of Independence, Missouri.

"(2) The owners of property referred to in paragraph (1) on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for a term of up to and including 25 years or, in lieu thereof, for a term ending at the death of the owner or the spouse of the owner, whichever is later. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved.

"(3) Unless a property acquired pursuant to this subsection is wholly or partially donated to the United States, the Secretary shall pay the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of acquisition less the fair market value, on that date, of the right retained by the owner under paragraph (2)."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The first sentence of section 2 of such Act is amended by striking "subsection (a)" and inserting "the first section of this Act".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 3 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", except for subsection (b) of the first section of this Act"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:  
"There is authorized to be appropriated \$250,000 to carry out subsection (b) of the first section of this Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 419, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 419 was introduced by our colleague, Representative ALAN WHEAT, with the cosponsorship of the entire Missouri delegation. The legislation would authorize the addition of three parcels to the Harry S Truman National Historic Site in Independence, MO.

The Harry S Truman National Historic Site was formally established in 1983 by Public Law 98-32. The 0.77 acre site, which is administered by the National Park Service, preserves the home of the former President for over

50 years and is located in a residential neighborhood of Independence, MO. The home and grounds were willed to the U.S. Government upon the death in 1982 of Bess Wallace Truman, the late President's wife.

The Truman National Historic Site is part of the larger Harry S Truman national historic landmark district, designated by the Secretary of the Interior in 1972. Immediately adjacent to the Truman home are the three homes proposed by H.R. 419 for addition to the Harry S Truman National Historic Site. The Noland/Haukenberry and the George and Frank Wallace homes are part of the Truman-Wallace family compound. The two Wallace homes, which lie directly east of the existing national historic site, were the residences of President Truman's brothers-in-law and their wives and are still in the family. The Noland/Haukenberry house, located across the street from the national historic site, was the home of Harry Truman's aunt. The future President made occasional visits to the home while he courted his soon-to-be wife, Bess Wallace.

Much of the life of our esteemed 33d President centered around Independence, MO, and his home of over 50 years in that community. That neighborhood in Independence was of great importance to him, both as a private citizen and as a political figure. His life in the community helped form and still symbolizes the late President's values of family, home, and community. The testimony we received on H.R. 419 attested to the historical significance of the three homes to the Truman National Historic Site. Beyond that, it is evident that the close physical proximity of these properties to the national historic site is integral to the interpretation and maintenance of the historic setting of the national historic site within the residential neighborhood in which it is located.

The provisions of H.R. 419 are consistent with the approved general management plan for the national historic site and are supported by the Truman-Wallace family, as well as the city of Independence. The relatively modest cost for acquisition of the homes as well as the possibility of a partial donation further makes the acquisition of the three homes in fee a more appropriate management policy for maintaining the historic setting of the site in perpetuity, in addition to increasing the opportunities for interpretation and public enjoyment.

I support H.R. 419, as introduced, and urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the subcommittee chairman has explained, H.R. 419 would provide for the acquisition and addition of three adjacent houses to the Harry S Truman National Historic Site in Independence, MO. The homes are part of the Truman-Wallace family compound and were occupied by relatives of the former President and his wife, Bess Wallace Truman. Appropriations of \$250,000 are authorized for the acquisition; however, it appears that at least one of the homes will be donated.

The National Park Service general management plan for the historic site identified the homes as nationally significant and recommended their addition to the site. The Park Service intends to use the homes for visitor support and park operations. Acquisition of the houses is also supported by the local community and local government officials.

Mr. Speaker, this bill enjoys strong bipartisan and administration support. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 419.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the principal author of this legislation, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT].

The gentleman from Missouri has done a masterful job in terms of bringing this proposal forward and gaining bipartisan support and administration support of the measure.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands for his guidance and support in bringing this legislation through committee and to the floor. I would also like to thank the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] for his support and early scheduling of this matter. Also, special thanks go to my colleague, friend, and cosponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 419 provides for the inclusion of three historically significant homes directly adjacent to the Truman home in the Harry S Truman National Historic Site in Independence, MO. This legislation is important to both the Truman neighborhood and the entire Nation to preserve the historic integrity of this area for future generations.

I would like to thank Mr. VENTO, the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands for his support of this legislation, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. UDALL, for scheduling early action on this measure.



The Truman home site and the Truman Library are two of the most popular attractions in Independence—indeed, in the entire Kansas City metropolitan area. Last year the Truman home was one of the top 25 attractions in the Kansas City area.

There are 39 cosponsors of this legislation, including bipartisan support from the Missouri delegation. I am also pleased to note that H.R. 419 was also endorsed by Mrs. Margaret Truman Daniel, Harry Truman's daughter, and is generally supported by civic leaders in the Independence area.

It is much easier to preserve a historic landmark before its historical integrity has been compromised and restoration efforts are complicated by land development, new construction, or extensive remodeling of historic structures. It is fortunate that the three homes affected by H.R. 419 have maintained much of their historical integrity and that the area has retained its comparatively low property values. Presently, it appears that one of the homes will be donated to the Government by its owner. H.R. 419 includes a \$250,000 limit on funding to acquire these properties. This presents a rare opportunity for preservation at a low cost to the Federal Government.

Congress created the Truman Historic Site in 1983 after the Truman home was given to the U.S. Government pursuant to the will of Bess Truman, who died in October 1982. The 1983 act creating the Harry S Truman National Historic Site—Public Law 98-32—included only the actual Truman home where Bess Truman grew up and where she and Harry lived from the time they were married in 1919. This act passed the Senate on May 6, 1983, and the House on May 10, 1983, by voice votes and was signed by President Reagan on May 23, 1983.

Since 1983 the National Park Service has maintained the home as a historical landmark. Because of the limited space available on the premises, however, the Park Service developed plans to add support space for the visiting public and for Park Service operations.

The Truman home is one of the most important historic resources in the Kansas City area and is one of Missouri's most treasured historic sites. Unfortunately, since 1984 the site has been identified by the National Park Service as one of several historic landmarks nationwide threatened by serious damage if further steps are not taken to preserve its surroundings.

In 1987 the National Park Service released a general management plan which recommended actions to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood that had such a strong influence on President Truman throughout his life. H.R. 419 implements an important part of the management plan by

authorizing the National Park Service to buy or accept as donations three historically significant homes directly adjacent to the Truman home as additions to the Harry S Truman National Historic Site.

Two of these homes belonged to Frank and George Wallace, the brothers of Harry's wife, Bess. Harry Truman's aunt, Margaret Noland, and her family lived in the third home. These three homes would contribute greatly to preserving the atmosphere around the Truman home and increasing understanding about the environment that shaped Harry Truman's life.

Our 33d President was known for his honesty, courage, and good common sense. President Truman's hometown paper called him a man of independence, remarking that it was his way of life as well as his hometown. His straightforward traits and speech were the products of both family and community influences. The Truman home, the Wallace homes, the Noland/Haukenberry home, and the other structures dating from the Truman period continue to tell the story of the President who never forgot his roots.

Harry Truman's favorite aunt, Margaret Truman Noland, and her husband Joseph and two daughters lived at 216 North Delaware, and as a boy Harry Truman was a frequent visitor in their home while his family lived at their Grandview farm. Good luck was on Harry's side, for his high school friend Bess Wallace lived directly across the street from the Nolands in the house that ultimately became the Trumans' home. Harry graduated from high school in 1901 but he reestablished the relationship with Bess in 1910. From then until 1914 Harry worked on his parents' farm during the week and lived with his aunt, uncle, and cousins on weekends, making it easier to see Bess.

After Harry and Bess were married upon his return from World War I in 1919, Harry moved into the Gates/Wallace house at 219 North Delaware where he and Bess lived for 50 years before Harry Truman died on December 16, 1972. Throughout the years of Truman's public life he always managed to spend some time at the Nolands'.

Harry Truman's family consisted not only of his immediate and extended family but his wife Bess' relatives as well. Her Grandfather Gates had built the house at 219 North Delaware which sheltered several generations of Wallaces, often more than one at a time.

In 1915 and 1916 two of Bess' brothers, Frank and George, were given 50 feet each of the garden area to the east of the main house to build their own residences for their new wives, Natalie and May. May Wallace still resides in one of these houses. Although the two new Wallace houses were sep-

arate physical structures, they were essential components of the Gates/Wallace/Truman compound. The Trumans and the Wallaces remained close in the ensuing years and the three houses are an integral part of what Harry Truman called home.

Throughout the senatorial and Presidential years Harry S Truman relied on his relatives by marriage for rest, relaxation, and help when needed. Family members in the Wallace houses provided an environment where Harry could relax and regain strength for upcoming political battles. The Wallace families provided meals and a place to sleep for the Trumans when the big house was not opened during quick visits to Independence. They also looked after the big house during the Trumans' long absences.

The entire complex at 219 North Delaware and 601 and 605 Truman Road can be considered a physical manifestation of a very close extended family. Harry Truman stayed in touch over the years with Wallace family members who were so important to him. The Wallace houses and their relationship to the big house at 219 North Delaware represent one of the crucial elements in Harry Truman's character. They symbolize his value system based on home, family and community.

Considerable growth in the city of Independence over the last 35 years has profoundly affected the Truman neighborhood. Urban development has significantly altered the northern part of the national historic landmark district. What was in 1950 a small city of 37,000 distinctly apart from Kansas City has expanded to a city of more than 120,000 with more than 8 times the land area.

Local streets in the district are now main traffic connectors linking major highways with the western edge of Independence. Truman Road intersects Interstate 70 in Kansas City and carries significant commuter traffic between the two cities. Even though the Truman home is situated within a residential neighborhood, there is heavy through traffic, particularly on Truman Road, which runs along the north side of the home.

The movement of population to eastern Jackson County and the change in lifestyle away from closely knit neighborhoods to suburban housing has permanently altered the smalltown fabric. The impact of these changes has not always been sympathetic to the previous neighborhood character. The enactment of H.R. 419 will help to ensure the protection of these three homes and preserve the dignified atmosphere of the neighborhood Harry Truman knew and loved.

These structures will provide an on-site reception area and interpretive fa-

cilities for visitors to the Truman home. The bill allows present owners, including Bess Truman's elderly sister-in-law May Wallace, to retain lifetime usage of their property. No other buildings or properties in the surrounding neighborhood would be affected. The bill includes a \$250,000 cap on expenditures to assure control over costs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help to preserve this important part of our Nation's historical heritage. This modest addition to the Harry S Truman National Historic Site will help to preserve the memory of President Truman's contributions to our country as a lasting tribute to a great American President.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, fellow colleagues, I rise today in support of H.R. 419, legislation to add three homes to the Harry S Truman Historic Site in Independence, MO. I have a deep interest in this legislation, the Harry S Truman Historic Site was at one time in my district.

I had the honor to meet and talk to Harry Truman. His beliefs and resolve are at the root of my career in public service. I am proud that Missouri's No. 1 citizen was born in a small town in my district, Lamar, MO. His legacy is not only that of Missouri, but the entire Nation.

Harry S Truman served his country during some of its toughest hours. As a soldier in World War I, and as a Senator and President during World War II, he faced the challenges and made the hard decisions that stand as some of the most important of this century. President Truman was a statesman, politician and true man of the people. I believe he remains a major historic figure for our Nation and the entire world.

The legislation that we are here to discuss today concerns the preservation of that rich Truman legacy. In 1983, the Harry S Truman Historic Site was established. In 1987 the site was identified by the National Park Service as one of several historic landmarks nationwide threatened by serious damage if further steps are not taken to preserve its surroundings.

Not only will this bill add property to the Truman home site, but it will protect the investment that our Federal Government already has in this project. The additional three homes stipulated in this bill also have historical ties to Harry Truman. Two of the homes were built by brothers of Harry's wife, Bess. President Truman's aunt and her family lived in the third home.

One other aspect of this legislation is tourism. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement, Tourism and Rural Development of the Small Business Committee, I understand the importance of the tourism dollar to many communities. Along with the Truman home, Independence is the location of the Harry S Truman Library and Museum, and the historic Independence Square. The addition of these three homes will enhance the integrity and preserve the dignity of this area.

This legislation will help preserve a part of our national heritage. Historical sites such as this help teach our youth that history is real, not just words on pages in books. Once arti-

facts of history and historic sites are gone, they can never be returned. This bill will carry on the memory of a great American and I urge its full support.

Once again, I want to thank my colleague ALAN WHEAT and his staff for their hard work on this issue. I also want to thank Chairman UDALL and Chairman VENTO for the prompt action they took on this matter.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from Kansas City, ALAN WHEAT, in cosponsoring and supporting H.R. 419, which provides for the inclusion of three historically significant homes directly adjacent to the Truman Home at the Harry S Truman National Historic site in Independence, MO.

The Harry Truman Home, established as a historic site by Congress in 1983, remains one of the most important historic resources in Missouri and serves to honor our 33d President. Unfortunately, the National Park Service has warned that this is one of several historic landmarks nationwide threatened with serious damage if not protected through further acquisition. Substantial development in the area has permanently altered the fabric of what used to be a small town.

This legislation is designed to address the threats identified by the Park Service and to maintain the integrity of the neighborhood that had such a strong influence upon President Truman.

President Truman was known for his honesty, courage, and plain-speaking common sense. He stood up for working people everywhere. The enhancement of the historic site, and the preservation of the atmosphere around the Truman home, will enable visitors to gain an unblemished appreciation of the life of a great American President.

This legislation allows the present owners to retain lifetime usage of their property and caps acquisition expenditures at \$250,000. It's a small price to pay to preserve the memory of President Truman's lasting contributions to our country.

□ 1240

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 419.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CORRECTING AN ERROR RELATING TO CERTAIN LANDS IN LAMAR COUNTY, AL

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 964) to correct an error in Pri-

vate Law 100-29 (relating to certain lands in Lamar County, AL), as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 964

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. LANDS IN LAMAR COUNTY, ALABAMA.

Section 1(b) of Private Law 100-29 is hereby amended by striking out "the northwest quarter southeast quarter of section 14" and by inserting in lieu thereof "the northwest quarter southwest quarter of section 14".

#### SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS; WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT.

(a) NUMBERING AND DESIGNATED RIVERS.—Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287) is amended as follows:

(1) Number the unnumbered paragraph relating to the Merced River in California as "(62)".

(2) Redesignate paragraph (62) relating to the Kings River in California as paragraph "(63)".

(3) Number the unnumbered paragraph relating to the Kern River in California as "(64)".

(4) Number the unnumbered paragraph relating to the Bluestone River in West Virginia as "(65)".

(5) Number the unnumbered paragraph relating to the Sipsey River in Alabama as "(66)".

(6) Redesignate paragraph (65) relating to the Wildcat Brook in New Hampshire as paragraph "(67)".

(7) Number the unnumbered paragraphs relating to rivers in Oregon added to national wild and scenic rivers system by the Omnibus Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-557) as follows: Big Marsh Creek, "(68)", the Chetco, "(69)", the Clackamas, "(70)", Crescent Creek, "(71)", the Crooked, "(72)", the Deschutes, "(73)", the Donner und Blitzen, "(74)", Eagle Creek, "(75)", the Elk, "(76)", the Grande Ronde, "(77)", the Imnaha, "(78)", the John Day, "(79)", Joseph Creek, "(80)", the Little Deschutes, "(81)", the Lostine, "(82)", the Malheur, "(83)", McKenzie, "(84)", Metolius, "(85)", Minam, "(86)", North Fork Crooked, "(87)", North Fork John Day, "(88)", North Fork Malheur, "(89)", North Fork of the Middle Fork of the Willamette, "(90)", North Fork Owyhee, "(91)", North Fork Smith, "(92)", North Fork Sprague, "(93)", North Powder, "(94)", North Umpqua, "(95)", Powder, "(96)", Quartzville Creek, "(97)", Roaring, "(98)", Salmon, "(99)", Sandy, "(100)", South Fork John Day, "(101)", Squaw Creek, "(102)", Sycan, "(103)", Upper Rogue, "(104)", Wenaha, "(105)", West Little Owyhee, "(106)", and White "(107)".

(8) Number the unnumbered paragraph relating to the Rio Chama in New Mexico as "(108)".

(b) NUMBERING OF STUDY RIVERS.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287) is amended as follows:

(1) Redesignate paragraph (96) relating to the Merced River in California as paragraph "(99)".

(2) Number the unnumbered paragraphs relating to rivers in Oregon designated by the Omnibus Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-557) for study for potential inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system as follows:



Blue, "(100)", Chewaucan, "(101)", North Fork Malheur, "(102)", South Fork McKenzie "(103)", Steamboat Creek, "(104)", and Wallowa, "(105)".

#### SEC. 3. MILITARY LANDS WITHDRAWAL ACT OF 1986.

Section 2(c) of the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-606) is amended by striking "the office of the commander, Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Base" and inserting "the office of the commander, Luke Air Force Base".

#### SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS REGARDING THE MISSISSIPPI NATIONAL RIVER AND RECREATION AREA.

Title VII of Public Law 100-696 is amended as follows:

(1) In the third sentence of section 705(a), strike "Our" and insert "Other".

(2) In section 703(d), strike "to serve" and insert "and shall serve".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 964, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the staff of both the House and the Senate is to be commended for the professional workmanlike manner in which they accomplish their tasks, because we really have very few errors and these errors that we do have were not really attributed to the members of my staff or the Senate.

In the first instance it was just a drafting error in the way the bill came to us.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 964 is a bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL]. It would amend Private Law 100-29, relating to certain lands in Lamar County, AL, and make technical corrections in three other laws. Private Law 100-29 was enacted to enable the Bureau of Land Management to reinstate an erroneously canceled entry on certain specified lands in Mr. BEVILL's district, so BLM could remove a cloud from the title of the property, which has been in private hands for more than a century. Unfortunately, the bill as introduced evi-

dently contained an error in the legal description of the lands, which went undetected until after its enactment. H.R. 964 would correct that error, so that the purpose of the private law can be fulfilled.

The Interior Committee has also added three additional sections. Like the original bill, these new sections would merely make technical corrections to existing law.

Section 2 would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act so as to provide new paragraph numbers for some of the paragraphs dealing with various rivers that are part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System or that have been designated for study. This is a housekeeping matter that arises almost every time rivers or study rivers are designated, as occurred in the last Congress.

Section 3 would correct an error in the Omnibus Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1986. In section 2(c) of that act, dealing with the places where various maps and records are to be kept, there is a reference to the "Barry M. Goldwater Air Force Base". That is erroneous, because while that military withdrawal law did rename the Luke Air Force range after former Senator Goldwater, the bill did not rename Luke Air Force Base, near Phoenix. This same change was passed by the House in the last Congress as part of the California military withdrawal bill, but the Senate did not complete action on that bill. The Interior Committee believes this is an appropriate vehicle for making this purely technical change.

Finally, section 4 would make two amendments to title VII of Public Law 100-696, which provided for the establishment of the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area. The first change would correct a printing error, by substituting "other" for the word "our" in the third sentence of section 705(a) of that act. The second change would make a grammatical correction, by replacing the phrase "to serve" in section 703(d) with the phrase "and shall serve". Both of these changes are purely technical in nature, and would have no substantive effect.

Mr. Speaker, the reported bill was worked out with the minority, and I believe that there is absolutely nothing of controversy in it. I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 964 that would make technical corrections to a number of pieces of legislation already passed into law.

As the subcommittee chairman has mentioned, this bill has four operative sections, each making technical corrections to a different law. The first sec-

tion of the bill would correct mistaken land descriptions; the second, the numbering of sections in a bill; the third, correcting the name of an area; and last, a minor wording change to clarify who has the responsibility for action. As one can see, these are all minor changes, but necessary to make the law's implementation and purpose be as intended.

I know of no opposition to this bill and recommend its passage.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 964, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to correct an error in Private Law 100-29 (relating to certain lands in Lamar County, Alabama) and to make technical corrections in certain other provisions of law."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ADDITIONAL HISTORIC PROPERTY

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 999) to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended, establishing a program for the preservation of additional historic property throughout the Nation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H.R. 999

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 915), as amended (16 U.S.C. section 470 et seq.), is further amended as follows: Section 212(a) is amended by deleting the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the sentence "There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,500,000 in fiscal years 1990 through 1994."*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 999, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 999 introduced by our colleague Representative LINDY BOGGS and cosponsored by our former colleague Dick Cheney, reauthorizes the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. At the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands hearing on H.R. 999, witnesses praised the Advisory Council for its work, and made several suggestions for the improvement of the Federal Historic Preservation Program. The criticisms we heard were oriented toward those other Federal agencies that did not involve the Advisory Council early enough in the cycle or did not give the Advisory Council's recommendations adequate consideration, thus short circuiting the process. In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Congress has long been quite clear that the agencies must both "take into account" the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and also give the Council a "reasonable opportunity to comment." That understanding needs to be reiterated.

Other issues raised include having diverse and balanced membership on the Council and having the Advisory Council work with the Department of Justice to clarify intergovernmental responsibilities under section 106. Finally, I want to be clear that we continue to believe that the Advisory Council plays a crucial role in preservation and that its independence is essential.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs adopted an amendment to change the title of H.R. 999 to better reflect its purpose. The new title will be "A Bill To Reauthorize the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and for Other Purposes."

Mr. Speaker, I endorse this bill, and want to commend the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for their efforts in promoting historic preservation in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Members of Congress that this legislation has been championed by our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS]. She has developed an impressive list of cosponsors, including the former Congressman, Dick Cheney, who now is over in the Department of Defense, where we hope he will con-

tinue his interest in historic preservation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS].

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 999 is important because it will assure the continued availability of an independent Federal capacity for coordination of Federal efforts to encourage and support historic preservation.

As you have heard, joining in the cosponsorship of this bill to provide for the reauthorization of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation was our former colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. Cheney, who of course is now our Secretary of Defense. We are very grateful to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and to the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] and, of course, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], and to the other members of the subcommittee and their staff members for the expeditious and favorable consideration of the bill.

H.R. 999 is necessary legislation because the Council's current authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 1989, and because its continued operation is key to the Federal Government's efforts to facilitate the preservation of places important to our national heritage. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation plays a critical role in assuring consideration of historic preservation concerns in the development and implementation of Federal programs and policies.

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation [ACHP] was established by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470) to advise the President and Congress on preservation matters and to comment on Federal, federally assisted and federally licensed undertakings having an effect upon historic properties. H.R. 999 would amend section 212 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to continue the appropriations authorization from fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 1994 at a level of \$2.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, the primary role of the ACHP is to assist Federal agencies in exercising national leadership in historic preservation and to ensure that Federal actions are consistent with historic preservation values to the maximum extent possible. Since preservation policies must be balanced against other national policies and goals, Federal agencies require advice and assistance both in the development of general programs and policies and in the design and review of particular projects. The ACHP provides such advice and assistance to the President, the Congress and the Federal agencies and assists and encourages State and local governments and

private parties in preservation activities.

The accommodation of preservation values within public policies necessitates the acknowledgment of many competing forces, Mr. Speaker, and it is fortunate that, with all of these divergent views, there exists an independent body at the Federal level to assist in balancing historic preservation against other interests. The ACHP helps Federal agencies in meeting their statutory historic preservation obligations by institutionalizing preservation expertise and planning systems, eliminating duplicative efforts, improving the consistency of preservation policies and avoiding unnecessary expenditures of public funds.

Appropriated funds for the ACHP in fiscal year 1989 were \$1,778,000 and the budget request for fiscal year 1990 is \$1,795,000. According to the ACHP, the amount requested will support the continued provision of current services in fiscal year 1990.

There is no question that this is money well spent. Our historic resources are our national treasures. They assist us in our efforts to weave into our present future the cultural, historic and architectural richness of our past. Once lost, these national treasures can never be regained.

The exemplary manner in which the City of New Orleans has been able to bring its historic heritage into the present and future by preserving while growing and developing is a source of great pride, and I am well aware of how difficult this can be to accomplish. So, therefore, I can particularly appreciate the important job the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation performs for all of us and for those who come after us.

I feel certain that our former colleague, Mr. Cheney, would want to join me in urging the favorable votes of all of our colleagues on this reauthorization.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS] very much for her leadership on this issue. We appreciate her interest and her continued support in this matter on the subject of historic preservation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 999 was introduced in February by Representatives BOGGS and CHENEY. As the subcommittee chairman has explained, it would amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to reauthorize the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for 5 years at the currently authorized appropriations level of up to \$2.5 million annually.



The Council was established as an independent agency of the Federal Government to advise the President, the Congress, and Federal agencies on historic preservation matters. It also provides comments and advice concerning Federal, federally assisted and federally licensed activities which affect historic properties. In addition, the Council assists State and local governments and private parties with preservation activities. According to testimony presented at the subcommittee hearing, the Council has been responsive, diligent, and effective in meeting its obligations under the National Historic Preservation Act while maintaining its independence and autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 999 is a good, bipartisan measure which is supported by the administration. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to approve the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 999, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to reauthorize the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1487, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1990 AND 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 101-22) on the resolution (H. Res. 126) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1487) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for the Department of State, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### NOW I KNOW HOW TO SOLVE THE DRUG CRISIS: MOVE THE CAPITAL EVERY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, now I know how to solve the national drug crisis: We can move the Capital and the Federal Government every month to a different city. Then when the President and the Congress see how awful the drug problem is in that city, they will announce

emergency actions and provide the resources to stop that city's drug epidemic.

Just like was announced yesterday in the District of Columbia.

I propose we first move the Capital to Oakland, CA. The people of Oakland's lives are at least as important as the people of Washington, DC's, yet they face the same daily gun battles, the same murders, the same lack of street police, the same court backlogs, the same grossly overcrowded jails, the same lack of treatment facilities, the same rundown public housing, the same overburdened school system, and the same joblessness.

If the Federal Government can use national tax dollars to help the District with these problems in order to fight drugs, then it should also provide the same help to Oakland, Chicago, Newark, New York—you name it.

Mr. Speaker, I resent the flow of more Federal dollars to this city, the richest metropolitan area in the Nation, when my community of Oakland—and so many other American cities—are fighting—and losing to—the same cancer.

Let's help all our cities—not just Washington, DC.

#### THE "VALDEZ" OILSPILL IN ALASKA'S PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, on March 24 the Exxon tanker *Valdez* struck a reef in Alaska's Prince William Sound. An ultra large crude carrier, 987 feet long and 166 feet wide, in striking the reef, ruptured its forward tanks and spilled more than 10 million gallons of crude oil into the bay.

Prudhoe Bay crude oil is especially rich in longlasting toxic hydrocarbons because it is pumped directly from the ground into the pipeline.

I would point out to my colleagues that the cleanup has been a botched operation from the start. The contingency plans assumed that the worst set of circumstances would be 4 million gallons spilled. This is now two and one-half times that. Exxon said that the containment booms could survive any set of weather contingencies, but they were not deployed until 35 hours after the spill because the boom deployment barge was broken. Only 4,000 gallons of dispersant was available instead of the estimated one-half million gallons that would have been needed. That is like trying to put out a fire by spitting on it.

Of the seven available oil skimmers that were in the immediate area, none reached the area until the second day. That is like trying to clean a sandy beach with a pair of tweezers. And now, Mr. Speaker, we read that Exxon intends to add insult to environmental injury by deducting the cost of the cleanup from its taxes that it would have to pay to the U.S. Government.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of blame to go around; oh, yes, to us in the Fed-

eral Government, I suppose, for not properly overseeing the exigencies of the contingency plan as they have been developed.

One thing is clear, and that is the ship ran aground because the captain had put the ship on autopilot. It suggests to me, my colleagues, that our regulatory regimen and the oil industry have been on autopilot when it comes to protecting the fragile environment of our Alaskan brothers. It is time to take the regulatory ship off of autopilot, and that does not mean we have to stop or dismantle the ships, but someone has to be at the helm. Someone has to be responsible.

We do not need deregulation. What we have in effect is unregulation. We have in this regulatory regimen, if my colleagues will pardon the use of that expression, an oil industry that is exempt from RCRA, and studies on oil waste have often been long delayed. The regulations were there we have discovered. They just were not enforced. The plan was inadequate, and no one did what they were supposed to do under an inadequate plan. The cleanup was inadequate, and Exxon was left in charge.

Mr. Speaker, the damage to the environment, the damage to the economy of Alaska, the damage to a merchant marine system of Exxon, heretofore regarded as one of the best of the merchant marine companies in the natural resource transportation area, had generally been perceived well, has also been severely damaged. Thousands of birds, marine mammals, fish, are dead or dying. Deer are dying along the shoreline from eating plants soaked in oil, loss of an entire year of fishing with accelerating future losses in the breadth and depth that are heretofore unimaginable. A herring fishery closed because of oil in the spawning beds, and plankton that fish need for survival are dying off in the thousands of pounds. Hundreds of miles of shoreline, oiled and lifeless. Gasoline prices are rising.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is much in the American people's mind to dispute the need to respond appropriately, efficiently, and effectively, but to hear that the prices are going to rise at the same time the company contemplates charging the U.S. taxpayers by deducting the costs of their negligence from the taxes they pay is just incongruous and a crime in and of itself.

Mr. Speaker, this disaster of the last several weeks underscores horribly our energy dependence. It should underscore for all of us the volatility of exploring for oil in a fragile ecosystem, an ecosystem that is very, very dependent upon the good graces of nature and the good influence of man.

Many suggestions will come forward in the next several weeks about how to preclude these kinds of circumstances

from happening again. It is very clear to this Member that the Federal Government's role is going to have to significantly expand.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak to other possible solutions that might be available to us, let me ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] if he would like to join, and respond and participate in this special order. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, 2½ weeks ago, on Good Friday, the inevitable happened in Prince William Sound, AK. A 2-year-old 987-foot-long tanker, owned and operated by one of America's largest corporations, struck a well-marked reef and spilled over 11 million gallons of oil into some of the richest waters in the world.

There will be plenty of time for faultfinding, and the financial resources of the Exxon Corp. will follow the oil it brought out of the Earth and spilled on the sea, into every harbor and coastal village in south central Alaska. The company will give help—too little and too late—for the cleanup. It will provide monetary compensation—no substitute for prevention—for the loss of the fishing, tourism, and recreation industries. Much of my district depends on those industries, and the compensation will be needed, will be demanded, and it must be adequate.

But there will be no compensation for the birds, the seals, the sea lions, the sea otters, the shrimp, the millions of salmon, herring, and cod, who will lose their lives so that we may have oil. There will be no reckoning for the loss of vital links in the food chain that support so many hundreds of species, including our own.

Amid all the voices that will be raised—to blame and to explain—I would like to mention just one, once a powerful voice in this city, the voice of my most distinguished constituent and a friend of many of you, former Senator Warren Magnuson. Maggie, who gave us the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, had this to say:

We've got to have more stringent regulations to protect safety with all those tankers running around. We have to stiffen the Coast Guard's back.

A lot of us have been saying things like that over the past 2 weeks. But Senator Magnuson said those words in December 1976, when he was trying to keep the giant supertankers out of Puget Sound. Some of us in the State legislature tried to do that too, but the Federal courts said the State couldn't protect its waters that way, coastal navigation was a Federal responsibility. So Maggie got the Federal law changed, with help from my friends Congressman NORM DICKS, and former Transportation Secretary Brock Adams.

Senator Magnuson also tried to convince the Congress to require that tankers be equipped with double hulls. Some people felt that would be too expensive. Now we learn that a double hull would have added 10 percent—\$11 million—to the cost of the *Exxon Valdez*.

It is a tiny fraction of the cost Exxon will ultimately pay for this catastrophe, and Exxon's cost is only a part of what we will all pay.

Eleven million dollars is also a conservative estimate of the loss of northwest fishermen from the cancellation of this year's herring season in Prince William Sound. We've also lost the seasons for shrimp and black cod. Pink salmon bring in \$77 million a year. That means the loss of jobs and mortgage payments for the working people of Prince William Sound. The spill also threatens major salmon hatcheries, including the one on Esther Island, the largest in the world.

I don't know whether a double hull would have prevented last week's spill in Prince William Sound. But it might have limited the damage.

The cost of protecting our environment is high—it means more expensive tanker ship construction, more money for the Coast Guard and the National Marine Fisheries Service, more manpower and equipment for speedier responses to disasters.

But the cost of complacency, the cost of satisfying our appetite for non-renewable energy at whatever the risks, the cost of the recklessness that brought the *Exxon Valdez* onto Bligh Reef—is much greater.

Last week we heard that the *Exxon Valdez* might have been on autopilot when it crashed into the reef. That would make sense—our country's energy policy has been on autopilot for the last 8 years. We import more oil today than we did in the early 1970's. We built a pipeline across Alaska's wilderness so we could transport oil across Alaska's fishing grounds. We lowered motor vehicle fuel efficiency standards when we should have been raising them, and we're driving bigger cars now than we did before. We canceled conservation programs and neglected renewable resource development.

Last year President Bush stood beside Puget Sound and proclaimed himself an environmentalist. Now the Interior Department wants to open up our State's coastline. Where last winter's barge spill occurred, to offshore oil exploration and drilling. This area is also under study as a national marine sanctuary, with hearings this week in Seattle on the boundaries.

I want the administration to know that those boundaries must protect the marine life off our shores, the fisheries resources, and the Olympic peninsula's coastline.

□ 1310

The people of my State will be waiting to see how the environmentalist in the White House decides to treat our coast—whether the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will designate a marine sanctuary that protects our resources, or whether the Interior Department will proceed with an offshore oil lease sale that may squander them.

I am sure we will all learn lessons from the tragedy of Prince William Sound. I hope we will work together to pass some tough laws about oilspill liability, alcohol and drug abuse on the job, tanker safety, and State authority to protect State waters and shores. I hope we will restore the funding the Coast Guard needs to do its job right.

But one thing is absolutely certain: We will pay a price because of this environmental disaster. The captain of the tanker will be hung out to dry out. Exxon will be in court for years, facing hundreds of millions of dollars in liability claims. The State of Alaska will have to decide whether or not it can afford to base its entire economy on the oil industry. And we are already paying at the gas pump. Gas prices have gone up 10 cents a gallon already.

We must never forget that our water, our shores, this environment is not just property. The fish and crab are not just resources. They are our environmental heritage and we are morally obligated to preserve them. When will we become responsible caretakers of this Earth?

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read one quotation from children's literature. A wise man told a group of children:

It is not our part to master all the tides of the world. But to do what is in us for the succor of those years wherein we are set, uprooting the evil in the fields that we know, so that those who live after may have clear earth to till.

What weather they shall have is not ours to rule.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE], a young man who has been pitching for the environment in his entire term here in the Congress and is now in addition to that speaking on behalf of the sale and transfer of technology in the FSX matter between this country and Japan.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

I would like to commend the gentleman for calling this special order. It is an important special order. It is important under any set of circumstances and at any time and it is especially timely now in the context of the tragedy.



dy of what has occurred off the Alaska coast.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my colleague has called this special order so that those of us on this floor will have the opportunity to take time today to examine the *Valdez* disaster and to examine its implications for our Nation as a whole.

Let me start off by assuring my colleagues and those who may be focused on this tragedy that this spill is not just the tale of a drunken sailor. Instead, it is a story of industrial neglect and it is also a story of Federal dereliction of duty.

For years environmental experts warned about the risks, while the industry and a significant part of the Federal Government just looked the other way. Now we find that that same industry neglected to make even a good faith effort to plan for a worst case spill.

I read from the 1973 hearing record on the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline the then president of Alyeska testified:

In safety superior American tankers, the light traffic between Valdez, Alaska, and the west coast, involves hazards of less magnitude than any other tanker run of which I have knowledge. The most modern loading equipment and proposed Coast Guard vessel design requirements will reduce even these modest risks before pipeline operation begins.

Thus testified the president of Alyeska 16 years ago, in 1973.

Two years ago Alyeska looked at a make-believe spill of 8.4 million gallons. They determined that 50 percent of the spill would be recovered while in the water and another 15 percent would be removed from shore. That clearly was a pipe dream at best.

Meanwhile, the Federal Government stood back and watched the fiasco unfold. After the last two decades the Government itself has refused to address a worst case spill scenario, and as a result today the Nation grieves for the loss of an extraordinarily spectacular natural environmental resource.

It is now shocking to learn, as we have over the course of the last several weeks, that the previous administration under the auspices of Interior Secretary Donald Hodel tried to deliberately cover up, deliberately to whitewash, the probability of a spill off the California coastline in the event that offshore oil drilling proceeded as Donald Hodel and James Watt proposed. Also, this same administration, under the administration of Donald Hodel in the Reagan years covered up and whitewashed the ineffectiveness of our current cleanup of our current technology.

At a press conference last week a number of us from our delegation on a bipartisan basis detailed a series of internal agency memoranda which document that the Reagan administration sought to whitewash concerns about

both the likelihood and the impact of a major spill off the California coastline. As a result, 28 colleagues from California and from both sides of the aisle joined me in calling on the President to:

First, cancel the lease sale proposed off northern California because of the overwhelming evidence that that sale would be an ecological disaster; and second, either cancel or indefinitely postpone the other three lease sales that are planned for California's coastline because of these startling disclosures that we learned about last week, pending a complete reevaluation of the entire California OCS Program.

Let me briefly explain for the rest of my colleagues and for other interested people what these memoranda reveal.

I am delighted, incidentally, to see my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] join us on the floor. She will be speaking later in this special order. She was part of this press conference and has been intimately involved in these activities.

Last year our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Mr. LEON PANETTA, obtained and released a Fish and Wildlife Service report on the sale in northern California. That report last year offered devastating information about the risks that sale would present to the California coastline, and specifically about the likelihood and impact of a major spill off the California coastline.

At the same time, another sanitized version of the report appeared with many of the most damaging comments removed. Among the deletions were, and my colleagues should be clear on these, the material removed from the Fish and Wildlife Service report were:

The impact statement of the Department of the Interior downplays the potential impact of oil spills.

\*\*\* current technology cannot effectively clean up a spill.

That was deleted from the Fish and Wildlife Service document.

At that time I was concerned about the content of this report, but I was also disturbed that Fish and Wildlife went back and laundered a document, sanitized a document, that was already a part of the public record. This prompted me to launch an inquiry into the matter, and what I found was the smoking gun of an agency whitewash.

I received a memo from the then Secretary for offshore development, Steven Griles, to his counterpart for Fish and Wildlife, letting Fish and Wildlife know in no uncertain terms that Mr. Griles was most disturbed by their action.

Mr. Griles addressed Fish and Wildlife's substantive concerns with a barrage of allegations, and Fish and Wildlife responded by rethinking their comments and rewriting their report to meet the ideological litmus test of

Secretary Hodel and his assistant, Mr. Griles.

There was also a memo from the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in which he sought to alter another study of the northern California sale.

There was also a memo from an MMS official suggesting that future Fish and Wildlife reports should now be approved by MMS [Minerals Management Service], the entity that wants to see drilling at all costs, or at least did in the Reagan administration, these now should be approved by this entity, MMS, before being formally received.

Let us make sure there are not any glitches. Let us make sure the ideology is not contradicted by the professionals.

□ 1320

There was even a memo from the former regional director of MMS requesting that the sale be delayed, among other reasons, to reduce conflicts with a California primary that was to be held in June 1988. Do not allow any political opposition. Make sure that they do not have political conflicts when they know that the cross-section of the people of California are going to raise objections to this sale, and so we see a pattern of deliberate manipulation that was becoming increasingly clear under the stewardship of Donald Hodel.

I went on to look at the EPA report on the northern California sale, to find out if they had any concerns that might have been laundered, and I found that, indeed, there was laundering here as well.

Missing from EPA's final report were revealing statements such as:

Our overriding concern is that the (EIS), in its analysis and interpretation of the environmental consequences, tends to downplay the risks and environmental effects associated with a possible oil spill.

And finally, I asked NOAA if they had submitted comments to MMS on the northern California sale, and what I received I would hope would be the nail in the coffin for this ill-conceived proposal.

Let me just excerpt a few of their concerns quickly, and in the interest of time, I'll paraphrase:

It appears, said NOAA, the oil spill model may underestimate the occurrence of spill that would contact land.

The damage a spill could cause to coastal ecosystems appears to be underestimated; the EIS's assertion that a spill would only cause negligible to low impacts seems very conservative.

We remained concerned that the EIS may underestimate the expected effects of a major spill on fish and shellfish.

The EIS minimizes the potential economic hardship a spill would inflict on fishermen. It downplays the risk and impact a spill could have on commercial fishing.

All of this is extremely disturbing \*\*\* with sweeping implications for

the OCS Program on the California coastline.

Not only did we learn through our freedom of information request that Fish and Wildlife and the EPA deleted revealing analyses about the risks of a spill, but also that these two agencies, along with NOAA, asserted over and over again, that MMS itself, was deliberately downplaying the likelihood and impacts of a spill. And they used that word, downplaying, not underestimating, not second guessing, but downplaying. It was intentional. It was intentional according to professionals in the same administration whose judgment should have been allowed to be public.

What is so striking about all their comments is that they anticipated, if not the scope, at least the precise nature, of what was to come: the worst oilspill in this Nation's history.

Those professionals were right. They know about spills, they know about cleanup, and they know about probabilities.

I am here today to tell the Members that it happened in Valdez, and, though perhaps not in its astronomical size, certainly in its catastrophic impact, it could happen off California, if we were to allow the Reagan-Watt-Hodel plan to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who represent that great State and that irreplaceable resource, that irreplaceable treasure, will not stand by and let this happen. We will not ignore the risks of drilling off our coast as the Reagan administration and others in this Government did for Alaska, and we will not allow any agency to whitewash the potential for another environmental disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we are eager, therefore, to hear back from the President on the bipartisan proposal that my colleagues and I sent to him urging him to cancel the California sales while the State's OCS Program is revamped.

It is our sincere hope that he will not blunder as previous administrations have, that he will, instead, rise to the task at hand, that he will cancel the sales off the California coast, and that he will support the safeguards to ensure Alaska and the rest of America that this never again happens and that we never again endure a Valdez catastrophe.

My colleagues, this is a unique opportunity for a new administration. They have seen whitewashes. They have seen coverups by the last administration. They have seen ideology run rampant and professionalism submerging and suppressed. President Bush now has the opportunity to be the environmental President he promised in his campaign he would be.

As tragic as Valdez has been, let him take this opportunity to change course, to demonstrate a new sensitivity and respect for the environment, to

instruct his Interior Department and the EPA to rely on the professional and scientific conclusions, not allow them to be suppressed in this administration, to go back to the drawing boards, cancel the proposed sales off California, and provide for this Nation the environmentalism that was promised in the campaign, the respect for the natural resources and the natural treasures that the Nation should be able to bestow upon future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank and compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, for calling this special order and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's allusion to the political campaign ads of this past season could only lead one to the conclusion that if Prince William Sound could have been made into a campaign commercial, it would have made today's Boston Harbor's commercial look like a romper room in the middle of the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have all watched with growing horror as the oil spilled off Valdez, AK, has enveloped salmon, otters, and sea lions. Now it is poisoning sea birds and deer near the formerly pristine Prince William Sound.

We have listened as Exxon officials have first claimed full responsibility, then blamed the Coast Guard and the weather. We have heard Exxon's promises to pay the full cost of the spill, the full cost of cleanup.

What is most insulting to the American taxpayer, lulled by repeated promises from Exxon that they would clean up and pay for the costs, is that these cleanup costs, and the cost of restitution paid to local inhabitants and others, are fully deductible business expenses under section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code. That's right, the single richest multinational corporation in the world will write off all expenses from cleaning up this disaster as ordinary and necessary business expenses. Thus, under current law, the American taxpayer will end up footing the bill for the Exxon oilspill.

An oilspill is not ordinary. An oilspill is not necessary. The spill of oil in Prince William Sound has been a profound lesson in unnecessary and extraordinary negligence.

Our Nation needs oil, we need responsible organizations to bring that oil to us. But we need those organizations, those corporations, to own up to their faults, not pass the buck to the American taxpayer through us, the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we need changes in the Tax Code to end tax breaks for negligence and pollution. This Nation must support business. But America must support good business. Pollution is bad

business. Deficits are bad business, and tax breaks for pollution that cause deficits are just plain dumb.

For Exxon to pass any portion of the extraordinary costs of this cleanup to the hard-pressed American taxpayer is unacceptable. Last year Exxon turned a profit of over \$5 billion on revenues of \$88 billion. The oilspill may even increase those revenues as gasoline prices rise around the country.

The residents of the Chicago area, the citizens of my district, worked hard for their salaries, their pensions. Each year at this time they sit down to pay out part of that hard-earned money as part of a civic duty, a contribution to the good of the Nation.

Are we to tell our constituents that they are not eligible for a tax break because they did not spill millions of gallons of crude oil all over their neighborhood, ruin the local businesses, put thousands out of work, and kill fish and birds for miles around?

America is saddled with monumental deficits and the American taxpayer is strained to the limit. We cannot allow one of the world's most profitable corporations to pass along yet more costs to the Government and the taxpayer.

We need a change in the law. The chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, WALTER JONES, has introduced H.R. 1465, the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act. This is a vital step along the path we must take to end the passing of the polluter's buck to the American taxpayer. I have cosponsored this legislation and call upon all of my colleagues to do the same. Further changes will be necessary in the Tax Code as well, to end tax-writoffs for big business negligence.

In the short term, Exxon must work harder and faster to clean up the rapidly spreading slick of oil. I also call upon them to make a donation in lieu of taxes to the U.S. Government, earmarked for Coast Guard and now military cleanup costs for this spill. This donation should, at the very least, cover the amount saved on their taxes through their expense deduction.

The Congress of the United States is responsible to the American people to see that the deficit is eliminated and that all pay their fair share. Only when we work to protect our fiscal security and our environment will we fulfill our duties to the citizens of America.

□ 1330

Mr. ECKART. I thank my colleague from Illinois for his participation, and I would associate myself with his remarks most directly.

For a company such as Exxon to profit at the expense of the American taxpayers for in some circumstances irreplaceable and irreparable damage they have done to our environment is



not just bad tax policy, it is an abhorrent moral repudiation of what we should stand for as a people. I look forward to assisting my friend from Illinois in whatever way he thinks would be appropriate to effect that change in the Tax Code, because as my son would say, "Dad, it just doesn't make sense."

Mr. LIPINSKI. I certainly agree with your son, it does not make any sense at all.

Mr. ECKART. I thank my colleague from Illinois.

My friend from the State of Washington [Mr. SWIFT] whose district bordering Puget Sound is most peculiarly sensitive to the transshipment of hazardous and perhaps even toxic substances in an area of the Nation that is most sensitive to environmental concerns has joined us, and I will recognize him in a moment. I would like to point out to my friend that if the area that is now currently covered by the Exxon spill were translated to what perhaps folks on the east coast could relate to, it would cover a distance longer than Long Island, Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard, and Kennebunkport's seacoast taken together. I think if that oilspill were perhaps in the President's backyard we would have seen more appropriate action.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much and appreciate his leadership in calling this special order. He referred to my district which contains the northern part of Puget Sound, and the Pacific coast, about the top half of the Pacific coast in Washington State.

I have unfortunately suffered through four oilspills in my congressional district in the last 3 years. So I am not someone to talk to about the fact that they are impossible or unlikely. Rather it is demonstrable that they are inevitable.

I remember in my former life when I was a television news reporter doing a number of reports and programs on the fact that we did not have any coherent plan in Puget Sound to deal with oilspills, and we had no real equipment established in the area to deal with oilspills.

Perhaps it was because that was such a controversy, perhaps it was because there was a political controversy of whether or not to allow supertankers into the sound at that time, I am not exactly sure what triggered it, but we do have a response capability in Puget Sound now. I am not going to suggest for a moment it could not be improved, but compared with what they had going for them in Alaska, ours is superb. It is somewhat reassuring if we are going to have to have oilspills to be able to walk into the headquarters of the cleanup effort on your second oilspill and see virtually the

same people who were there working on the first one, people from State government, from the Coast Guard and other Federal agencies, and from the private sector, all knowing each other, knowing what their individual roles are, understanding the coordination of authority in the situation, and being able not to figure out what to do, but already doing what should be done and spending their time and their effort out cleaning up the spill, having the equipment and the facilities available.

And in one instance, I must say that sometimes I think the good things, the good stories there are to tell about some of the private sector do not get told, there was a specific instance in Port Angeles where the oilspill was flowing with the tides down the Straits of Juan de Fuca. It was less than an hour when the tides would change, and given the wind conditions it would have pulled this oil slick not back out to the ocean, but back into a small bay from which it would have been virtually trapped. The Coast Guard suggested to the company, which in this instance happened to be Arco, that if a certain piece of equipment and certain actions could be taken right now, that would be prevented.

I was informed that the company had every legal right to have stopped and paused, talked about liability and a variety of other things. It did not. It moved. It took care of that problem on the spot and saved that bay, the Dungeness Bay, from pollution.

But none of that could occur if we did not have a plan to begin with, if people did not understand what the relationships were between the various agencies, if people did not know how to coordinate the various responsibilities, and if they did not have the equipment in place to be able to do it.

I made a mistake. I think a lot of my colleagues here in Congress made a mistake in assuming that because I had seen these plans and this equipment in place, and seen it working in my backyard, that we had that kind of cleanup capability and plan everywhere else, and it is obvious we do not. It is responsibility I think to see that those in administrative capacities at the State and Federal levels and in the private sector see that everywhere we as Americans have authority for what has been done in Puget Sound, and perhaps do it even better. To do less is at best stupid, and at worst criminal.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ECKART. I thank my colleague from Washington. As usual, he has stated matters in a most direct and forthright way.

If folks would realize that many years ago, 16, to be exact, we had a chance to prevent this from happening, I guess we could refer to this, most folks will call it the Exxon oil-

spill, but I might like to call it the Spiro Agnew memorial oilspill. It was 16 years ago, after all, that the U.S. Senate on a tie vote, 49-to-49, allowed the then-sitting Vice President to cast the tie-breaking vote in favor of Valdez and against the environmentalists' proposal to provide for transshipment of this oil, not necessarily all together as good an idea as some might like. But somewhere, somehow, the consequences of actions even of Spiro Agnew come home to roost, and we pay the price for that 49 to 49 tie today with an impact upon our environment, the consequences of which will be ill-defined for decades.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER], has spent a great deal of time working on environmental matters, not only that may affect her home State, but have national significance as well. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for holding this special order. I think it is exceedingly important that we focus on the tragedy that we are seeing every night when we put on our TV's, the anguished faces of the fishermen as they look at what has happened to the fisheries in Alaska. We already know three of the fisheries are gone for now.

□ 1340

They are struggling to save the salmon industry. We do not know if they will.

The anguished faces of the citizens of Alaska, as they see the fish and wildlife that they have come to love, and they live among the wildlife there, they see these fish and wildlife dead, soaked with oil. Thousands of sea otters, the ones that have not totally sunk to the bottom because they are so soaked with oil, are shivering as their natural fur cannot get them dry and warm. They are doomed. I hear reports where the bald eagles are now coming and feeding on the fish that are soaked with oil and now the bald eagles are dying because of this spill.

We see the anguished face of the Governor of Alaska as he sees the string of broken promises made by Exxon and the administrations of the recent past, promises that were supposed to result in double-bottomed vessels, in a 5-hour emergency response that in no way even came near 5 hours. It was more like 5 days.

They were supposed to promise exceptionally well-qualified pilots. This disastrous oilspill can happen again. It can happen off the coast of California, which I represent; it can happen in Alaska; it could happen in Washington State, anywhere along the coast. It is clear that as long as there are tankers carrying oil and there are human beings in charge, there is going to be

human error. It could happen at any time.

The issue is not the issue that President Bush would say it is. He said, "Well, what are these critics wanting us to do, stop oil production?" Of course not. We are not saying stop oil production. What we are saying is back up those promises, Mr. President, with laws, with enforcement, back up those promises with penalties.

Oil companies had better learn that it is not enough to take a full-page ad in the Wall Street Journal apologizing for the kind of disaster that happened and then think that the American people are going to forgive and forget. Too many broken promises.

As Mr. ECKART pointed out to us, and I am so glad he did, a 49-to-49 vote, a tie broken by the Republican Vice President at the time, because frankly sometimes around here there is too much kowtowing to the special private interests and not enough realization that we are here as stewards of the environment and protectors of people and the environment.

There is another thing that we want from this President and from this administration, and it is called truth. My colleague, the gentleman from California [MR. LEVINE], has spoken of cover-ups that have existed in the Department of the Interior under the Reagan and Bush administration. We have the proof, we have the documents. We see that reports that were made by Fish and Wildlife that were critical of drilling, that predicted what would happen in a spill, we know what happened to those reports. They were covered up.

I also had the privilege of being privy to some documents that had to do with drilling in Alaska. You know what happened there? I say this to my friend the gentleman from Ohio [MR. ECKART] in Alaska there was the same pattern of coverup.

In one case, a memo that was critical of oil development was ordered destroyed. I saw the words come from the Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife "collect and destroy copies" of the memo. It could inhibit development of oil in Alaska.

So, in light of this incredible history we have to learn, we have to learn that the risks of oilspill are far greater than we thought, because much of the documentation has been covered up.

No, we are not going to stop tankers but we had better understand the risks that we face.

The gentleman from Washington [MR. SWIFT] said we had better spend the money it takes to get plans in place and make sure that there can no longer be broken promises by the oil companies.

In California this administration wants to drill off of our coast. This would increase the threat of oilspills. They want to drill, even, and this is incredible, in a proposed marine sanctu-

ary. Imagine, allowing offshore oil drilling in a marine sanctuary.

It would be the first time it was ever done. But this administration says they do not see any inconsistency of allowing offshore oil drilling in a marine sanctuary.

Well, we see the inconsistency in the California delegation, the Democratic delegation, and there are members of the Republican delegation that also see those inconsistencies, and we are going to fight this.

We have an answer for California, and it is called the Ocean Sanctuary Fisheries Enhancement Act. It would cut down on the risk of a disastrous spill in California so that we do not have to see our fishermen with looks of anguish on their faces as we have seen night after night in Alaska.

There are only 39 days' worth of oil off the California, northern and central coasts, hardly enough to make a dent toward energy independence.

If we just added one more mile of automobile economy to our fleet, we would have in very short order more energy saving than lies off the coast of California.

Mr. Speaker, here is the situation in sum: First, we have a disastrous oilspill in Alaska. We now know what could happen and what could happen again.

Second, we have a disastrous prediction of the greenhouse effect, which comes to us very clearly from many scientists who tell us we are burning too much fossil fuel, and we are not going to retain our health as a community and as a society because of these problems.

Third, we have great hopes in alternative energies such as solar energy, and now fusion, which could present us with endless energy that is clean.

So, put all these things together, and what does it say? It says that we need an energy policy in this country. Let us not just drill offshore at any cost, because I say to the President the cost is too great.

Unfortunately, I say to my colleagues we do not see yet an energy policy coming from this administration. It is more of the same, some nice lip service to the environment.

The President says, "I want to be an environmentalist," but yet we do not even see the beginnings of an energy policy.

If we learn anything from Alaska, it is that we have to have an energy policy in this country and we have to have protections built in where we do allow drilling.

The cost is too great, I say to the gentleman from Ohio, to continue the ways we are going. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio from the bottom of my heart for holding this special order. I think the members of the California delegation and the mem-

bers from the coastal States are very grateful to the gentleman from Ohio.

We must learn from this experience, and we must keep on talking about it so that people do not forget, because what happens when they forget, the special interests come in and suddenly we are back where we started.

We say never again.

Once again I say to the gentleman from Ohio, "Thank you for taking this special order."

Mr. ECKART. I thank my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, our last speaker is our colleague from the State of Washington who, like one of the previous speakers, who also was from Washington, understands firsthand the importance of preserving and protecting our environment.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after midnight on March 29, the 978-foot tanker *Exxon Valdez*, carrying approximately 60 million gallons of North Slope crude oil, ran aground on Bligh Reef in Prince William Sound, AK. This incident is an environmental disaster, spilling 11 million gallons of oil into one of the most biologically productive and pristine ecosystems of this country.

In the wake of this tragedy, fingers are being pointed at the skipper of the vessel who was allegedly intoxicated and criticism is continuing to focus on why it took so long to respond and specifically why were not the federally approved contingency plans implemented quickly and effectively.

Let us consider the lasting effects the oilspills will have on the Alaskan environment and its valued fisheries resources and for those individuals who depend on those resources for their livelihoods. The herring fishery has already been closed. It is only a matter of time before we see a devastating impact on the estimated 650 million salmon fry scheduled within the next few weeks to be released from hatcheries and on the hundreds of millions more that will escape from streams. After the past several years where northwest fishermen have lost tens of millions of salmon to illegal high seas interception by the driftnet fleets of foreign countries, they now have to face massive mortalities of their bounty in their own backyard fishing grounds.

Mr. Speaker, during the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee hearing last week, the Exxon Corp. went on record as being committed to paying all reasonable claims relating to the *Valdez* spill. We must hold them to that claim. The victims of this accident should be promptly and ade-



quately compensated for losses due to the gross negligence of Exxon.

Mr. Speaker, while compensating the victims of the *Valdez* spill is of top priority, I am also deeply concerned that damaging oil spills continue to occur along our coastlines, resulting in property and environmental damage. With the recent oil spills off the coasts of Washington and Hawaii, the United States has now experienced three major oil spills in the last 4 months. This raises serious questions about the oil industry's claim of having the sufficient advanced technology to produce and transport oil without damage to the environment. Perhaps most distressing is the statement released by the president of the American Petroleum Institute that the 11 million gallons of oil spilled in Valdez amounts to only a very small portion of the total oil shipped from Alaska. Hearing this type of logic coming from the oil industry, and having seen firsthand the 231,000 gallons of oil spilled off Grays Harbor in my congressional district, I am convinced that comprehensive Federal oil spill legislation is sorely needed.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, legislation to address oil spills has already been introduced in this Congress. I would like to point out that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, WALTER JONES, introduced oil spill legislation on March 16 of this year. H.R. 1465, which I have cosponsored, establishes a single Federal system to define who is liable for the damages of oil pollution, what they are liable for, and the amount of liability. In addition, this bill establishes a sizable cleanup fund, up to \$500 million, to cover the cost of cleaning up the oil and compensating those who suffer damage from it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I feel there is an important lesson that we can learn from the recent oil spill. We are a nation dependent on oil, yet oil production is not as safe as the industry would like us to believe—even for a company as well equipped as Exxon. There will always be a risk, and there will always be the possibility for human error. In the coming months we will consider several important energy issues, including whether to allow oil and gas development off our coasts and within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I believe decisions of such far-reaching significance should be considered only in the context of a comprehensive national energy policy which sets forth clearly and rationally the full range of alternatives before the Nation. Until we have such a policy, the decision to expose our most sensitive ecosystems to oil development should wait.

□ 1350

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Washington for her important remarks and contributions.

Our last speaker will be the gentlewoman from the State of New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Last Thursday the Coast Guard Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee conducted a hearing to get to the bottom of what happened when the oil tanker *Exxon Valdez* ran aground on March 24 in Prince William Sound. We didn't answer all of the questions during that hearing, but it was a good start. As I'm sure many of my colleagues would agree, our focus should be on exploring ways to ensure that this type of accident does not happen again. One way we can do that is to tighten up the Coast Guard licensing requirements for seamen.

I have an especially difficult time understanding how Capt. Joseph Hazelwood could have been in charge of piloting a 1,000-foot oil tanker when his New York drivers license had been revoked not once, but three times. In fact, he has not been allowed to drive a car in New York State since last November. Even with that record he was fully certified to pilot an oil tanker carrying 60 million gallons of crude oil. Does that make sense?

Bringing Captain Hazelwood to justice will not erase the damage that has been done to the pristine environment of Prince William Sound, but it can and should deter other ship pilots from committing the same infractions.

The case of the grounded *Exxon Valdez* opens a Pandora's box of questions about how prepared we are to deal with a major oil spill. This accident also raises serious questions about the Coast Guard's certification process for pilots of commercial vessels. The House must act with speed to enact legislation to guard against this kind of tragedy happening again.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for her contributions.

I would, in conclusion, remind my colleagues, as Harry Truman once said, "Those who do not learn the lessons of history are condemned to repeat it."

To our President, Mr. Bush, who has said he wanted to be the education President, he has said he wanted to be the environment's President, he said he wanted to be the ethics President, we accept you at your word. But in this Chamber, Mr. President, actions speak louder than words.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, The *Exxon Valdez*, the *Exxon Valdez*.

This is a phrase that we will remember for the rest of our lives.

The *Exxon Valdez* is a story of lost faith and destroyed dreams.

Lost faith in American industry, because Exxon failed to live up to its promises and to keep our environment safe.

Lost dreams that America could preserve its most pristine environment, beautiful Alaska, for future generations.

I heard on the "Today" program this morning that Exxon was very much aware of the activities of the captain of the *Exxon Valdez*. The "Today Show" reported, that in the past, a second mate had the exact same problem with the captain. That the captain was drinking on duty and requiring staff to perform work they were not qualified to perform. This certainly must have come to Exxon's attention since the second mate reported it to Exxon and they have been involved in a lawsuit with the mate over this very issue for the past 3 years.

Exxon is raising its gasoline prices all over the country. Let me tell you—this is not fair. We are not going to pay for Exxon's mismanagement.

Remember, this is not simply a case of human error. I believe this is a clear example of corporate callousness. Someone at Exxon probably thought that it would cost too much to replace the captain.

That someone was very wrong.

Read my lips Exxon, your corporate profits are going to pay for this mess, not the American people.

We have another problem. What do we do about future energy supplies?

We can no longer just sit back and figure God will provide. It isn't going to happen.

Now is the time, in light of Three Mile Island, Global Warming, acid rain, and the *Exxon Valdez* to get serious about energy conservation. Now is the time for Americans to realize that Barry Commoner was right, "There is no such thing as a free lunch." The choices that we make all have costs.

For the last 8 years we had no energy policy in this country—and we need one. We need to look to the development of extensive energy conservation measures, wind energy, biomass, solar energy, fuel efficiency, and anything else brilliant minds can think up.

We need some leadership out of the White House in the development of a long-term energy strategy. We need to know that we have a future and that it is secure.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, First, let me thank my colleagues, Mr. FRANK and Mr. ECKART, for arranging this special order on the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill. As a member of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I have been actively involved with this matter for several weeks. Last Thursday, April 6, the subcommittee held a day-long hearing on the spill and much was learned.

There is no doubt that this is a terrible accident that must be viewed with the utmost seriousness. The spill will cause losses in our fisheries, wildlife habitat, and environment. I was pleased however, that Exxon chairman L.G. Rawl in his appearance before the subcommittee last week insisted that his company accepted full responsibility for the spill and would waive legal technicalities in shouldering the costs of both the cleanup and compensation of fishermen and others in the Valdez

area. I am also encouraged that the board of directors of the American Petroleum Institute this past Friday, April 7, set up a top-level task force to review the oil industry's operations as a result of the oil spill. The chief executives or presidents of all major oil companies have agreed to serve on the task force and shall report their recommended program within 3 months.

We will almost surely need to provide Federal oversight in the long-term recovery of Prince William Sound, in addition to assisting with the immediate cleanup. Oil spill liability legislation, specifically H.R. 1465, introduced by Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee chairman WALTER B. JONES, should be quickly considered by both Houses. We also need to study and possibly strengthen oil spill contingency plans, crew training standards, and pilotage requirements.

I should like to caution my colleagues from drawing the wrong conclusions from this tragic oil spill. If we do so, we may learn the far greater costs of energy dependence. An additional consequence of the oil spill has been to focus attention on where our energy supply originates. The fact is that more than one-fourth of the oil produced by our domestic wells is coming from the North Slope of Alaska. William Reilly, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, recently pointed out that if this oil did not come by tanker from Alaska, it would have to come by tanker from other parts of the world, tankers that dock at ports all along our Pacific, Atlantic, and gulf coasts. To use Reilly's own words:

There's always a cost to any of our energy choices. We have to remember that if we don't get the oil out of Alaska we'll be getting it from other countries.

More than likely much of this oil would come from Middle East OPEC nations on foreign tankers that historically have caused larger oil spills than U.S. tankers.

I also believe that it is extremely important to separate the tragic *Valdez* oil spill from current and future exploration and production whether it be on land or offshore. The *Exxon Valdez* oil spill is a transportation problem and has nothing to do with exploration and production. The United States is currently dependent on foreign oil sources for over 45 percent of our oil supplies and that amount will only increase, particularly if we allow this tragic incident to block efforts to expand domestic production.

Energy conservation is important and should be encouraged. Development of alternate fuels is also important. I also believe that we need to once again make nuclear energy an economically viable option to meet our future energy needs. In fact, I plan to introduce legislation that would reform the way we license nuclear powerplants in the near future and ask for my colleagues' support in this effort. My legislation would not only improve the safety of nuclear powerplants, but would also severely cut their construction time and cost. But none of these options alone can provide a viable solution to our current and future energy needs. We must push forward on all fronts, including finding and developing more oil reserves, such as the ANWR coastal plain.

As I have stated, the ANWR coastal plain is one of our last areas that offers great potential for a large petroleum discovery. And as EPA Administrator Reilly, who came from the environmental community, stated recently:

The petroleum industry has shown that it can find and produce that oil while protecting the arctic environment. The experience gained from 20 years on the North Slope next door to ANWR would be applied in exploring the ANWR coastal plain and, if oil is found, in developing the small area that would be affected by oil operations. And these operations would continue to be governed by the most stringent environmental laws in the world.

I hope that my colleagues take the advice of EPA Administrator Reilly and do not irrationally cut our domestic oil supplies. The *Exxon Valdez* oil spill is certainly a tragic event and we must do everything possible to prevent future spills. But prohibiting oil and gas exploration and development in ANWR will not prevent future oil spills. All it would do is deprive us of a potentially large source of oil that is vital to our economy and energy security. We simply cannot afford, to quote the *New York Times*: "To treat the accident as a reason for fencing off what may be the last great oilfield in the Nation."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DYMALLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

#### INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO SIMPLIFY THE CORPORATE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to simplify the corporate alternative minimum tax [AMT]. This was one of the most complicated provisions and difficult compromises of the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

Under present law, the structure of the corporate AMT will change for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1990. During 1987, 1988, and 1989, one-half of the difference between a corporation's book income and alternative minimum taxable income is added to the base of the AMT. After the end of this year, that preference item will be replaced with an inclusion of 75 percent of the difference between alternative minimum taxable income and what is called adjusted current earnings [ACE].

This change in the corporate AMT was agreed to during the conference on the 1986 act because of the view strongly held by many, including me, that the tax base should be determined by the Internal Revenue Code and not by the conventions under which accountants measure book income. When used

for tax purposes, the book income concept not only invites manipulation, but can lead to inequitable results because of timing differences between tax and accounting rules.

It is appropriate for the base of the AMT to be specified in the Internal Revenue Code. The scheduled switch to adjusted current earnings under present law moves in that direction but retains some references to the book treatment of items, particularly depreciation.

The bill I am introducing today would no longer treat adjusted current earnings as a separate preference item. Instead, individual items of adjusted current earnings would be incorporated into the regular minimum tax calculations. References to book treatment would be eliminated. The result would be to simplify substantially the computations required for the corporate AMT and to make more rational the basis for measuring minimum taxable income.

For items, such as depreciation, which presently are treated differently under adjusted current earnings from their minimum tax treatment, a single treatment would be provided. For example, depreciation would be measured generally by using the straight-line method over ADR midpoint lives without any reference to book lives.

I am introducing this bill in an effort to begin an informed discussion about possible modifications that would simplify the corporate AMT. In speeches last year before the tax section of the American Bar Association and the Tax Executives Institute, I announced that I had directed the staffs of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Joint Committee on Taxation to initiate simplification projects on discrete provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. This bill is one of the results of that simplification effort.

I am fully committed to tax simplification and I am open to constructive suggestions about the specific changes to the corporate AMT provided in this bill. I do wish, however, to emphasize that I will oppose any attempt to extend the arbitrary book income preference beyond its scheduled expiration at the end of this year.

Providing revenue estimates for changes in the corporate AMT is one of the most difficult assignments given to the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation. It will be some time before a revenue estimate can be provided for the introduced bill. It may, of course, be necessary to consider modifications to the bill in the event of unanticipated revenue consequences. On the other hand, I wish to emphasize that in introducing this bill, it is not my intention to either raise or decrease revenues. My purpose in introducing the bill is to simplify the corporate AMT based on policy principles, not revenue generation.

I believe that since the switch to ACE will occur at the end of this year, we must begin this discussion early in the year. I am profoundly disappointed that the Treasury Department has not submitted to Congress the report on the corporate minimum tax, due on January 1, 1989, mandated by section 702 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986. After taxpayers and practitioners have had a chance to analyze the bill, I hope that the Select Revenue



Measures Subcommittee, to whom I have referred this issue, will conduct hearings on my proposed simplification of the corporate AMT.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD the bill and a detailed explanation of this legislation.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in expressing grave concern for our environment in the aftermath of the tragic oil spill in Alaska.

Despite promises to the contrary, the oil industry has failed to properly respond to the disaster. Adding insult to injury was the failure of the Bush administration to mount a timely and concerted Federal response which would have significantly mitigated the devastation.

Mr. Speaker, given the inaction of the executive branch following this national tragedy, we must examine carefully any immediate proposals for offshore or coastal oil drilling in environmentally sensitive areas. In particular, we need to postpone exploration along the California coast until we have impartial scientific information which proves conclusively that we need no longer fear a disaster on the magnitude of the tragedy in Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, we must never again risk playing Russian roulette with either our environment or our common sense.

#### EXPLANATION OF H.R. 1761

The 1986 Tax Reform Act required corporations to compute their alternative minimum taxable incomes by reference to a measure of income which ensures that profitable companies pay at least a minimum amount of taxes. For tax years beginning 1987-1989, this alternative measure of income is based on the accounting concept of book income. The preference is one-half the difference between book income and what otherwise would be alternative minimum taxable income. For tax years beginning after 1989, this so-called "book income preference" is scheduled to be replaced by an adjustment for "adjusted current earnings" (ACE), which measures economic income by reference to the tax concept of earnings and profits, rather than by reference to book income. The ACE preference is 75 percent of the amount by which ACE exceeds what otherwise would be alternative minimum taxable income.

H.R. 1761 would simplify the corporate minimum tax for taxable years beginning after 1989 by repealing the ACE preference and integrating its component items into the regular minimum tax system as separate preferences. Consequently, each preference item would have a single prescribed treatment for purposes of computing alternative minimum tax. Those ACE preference items integrated into the regular minimum tax would become full preferences instead of 75 percent preferences, as under current law. The computation of certain preference items would be modified.

Under the bill, generally, depreciation would be computed using the present-law minimum tax treatment (sec. 56(a)(1)) for tangible property placed in service in taxable years beginning before 1990 and the alternative depreciation system for property placed in service thereafter. Thus, depreciation on tangible property placed in service before 1981 or to which the original ACRS system applies would not be treated as a preference; depreciation on tangible property placed in service in taxable years beginning before 1990 to which the new ACRS system applies would continue to be treated

as under present law (i.e., using the alternative depreciation system, but with 150 percent declining balance method for property other than real property); and depreciation on property placed in service in taxable years beginning after 1989 to which the new ACRS system applies would use the alternative depreciation system. Depreciation shown on the taxpayer's books would not be taken into account in determining alternative minimum taxable income. (This method of depreciation would apply to individuals as well as corporations.)

In the case of intangible drilling costs for corporations, the earnings and profits method (i.e., 60-month amortization for productive wells) would apply, without regard to the book method used by the taxpayer. This preference would replace the present-law regular corporate minimum tax preference (generally computed as excess IDC's over 65 percent of oil and gas income). Similarly, the allowance for depletion for corporations should be determined under the earnings and profit method (i.e., cost depletion) without regard to the method used for book purposes. This preference would replace the present-law regular corporate minimum tax preference (generally computed as percentage depletion limited to basis).

The remaining items of the adjusted current earnings preference would be treated as separate minimum tax preferences for corporations. Thus, for example, exempt interest income for corporations and the dividends-received deduction (with certain exemptions as currently provided under ACE) would become full preferences under the regular minimum tax.

Finally, the bill would make several minor changes. The corporate preference for circulation expenses would be conformed to the individual preference (i.e., 3-year amortization). Gain on installment sales with respect to which interest is paid at the tax underpayment rate would be allowed installment sale treatment for minimum tax purposes, since appropriate interest is being paid for the right to defer payment of the tax. Annuity income would no longer be treated as a preference item for minimum tax purposes. In addition, several nonsubstantive drafting simplifications are included in the bill.

#### H.R. 1761

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the application of the minimum tax in the case of corporations

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. ELIMINATION OF ADJUSTED CURRENT EARNINGS PREFERENCE; MODIFICATION OF OTHER PREFERENCES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (g) of section 56 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to adjustments based on adjusted current earnings) is hereby repealed.

#### (b) MODIFICATIONS OF OTHER PREFERENCES.—

(1) DEPRECIATION.—Paragraph (1) of section 56(a) of such Code (relating to depreciation) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) DEPRECIATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The deduction allowable under section 167 with respect to any tangible property shall be determined under the alternative system of section 168(g).

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROPERTY.—This paragraph shall not apply to property described in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of section 168(f).

“(C) NORMALIZATION RULES.—With respect to public utility property described in section 167(1)(3)(A), the Secretary shall prescribe the requirements of a normalization method of accounting for purposes of this section.”

(2) ADJUSTMENTS APPLICABLE TO CORPORATIONS.—Subsection (c) of section 56 of such Code (relating to adjustments applicable to corporations) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) ADJUSTMENTS APPLICABLE TO CORPORATIONS.—In determining the amount of the alternative minimum taxable income of a corporation, the following treatment shall apply (in lieu of the treatment applicable for purposes of computing the regular tax):

“(1) INCLUSION OF ITEMS INCLUDED FOR PURPOSES OF COMPUTING EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be included in gross income any amount which (but for this subparagraph) would be excluded from gross income but which is taken into account in determining the amount of earnings and profits. The preceding sentence shall apply in determining whether any other amount is allowable as a deduction.

“(B) INCLUSION OF BUILDUP IN LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS.—In the case of any life insurance contract—

“(i) the income on such contract (as determined under section 7702(g)) for any taxable year shall be included in gross income for such year, and

“(ii) there shall be allowed as a deduction that portion of any premium which is attributable to insurance coverage.

“(2) DISALLOWANCE OF ITEMS NOT DEDUCTIBLE IN COMPUTING EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A deduction shall not be allowed for any item if such item would not be deductible for any taxable year for purposes of computing earnings and profits.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR 100-PERCENT DIVIDENDS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any deduction allowable under section 243 or 245 for a 100-percent dividend—

“(i) if the corporation receiving such dividend and the corporation paying such dividend could not be members of the same affiliated group under section 1504 by reason of section 1504(b),

“(ii) but only to the extent such dividend is attributable to income of the paying corporation which is subject to tax under this chapter (determined after the application of sections 936 and 921).

For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ‘100 percent dividend’ means any dividend if the percentage used for purposes of determining the amount allowable as a deduction under section 243 or 245 with respect to such dividend is 100 percent.

“(C) TREATMENT OF TAXES ON DIVIDENDS FROM 936 CORPORATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining the alternative minimum tax foreign tax credit, any withholding or income tax paid to a possession of the United States with respect to dividends received from a corporation eligible for the credit provided by section 936 shall be treated as a tax paid to a foreign country by the corporation receiving the dividend.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF TAXES IMPOSED ON 936 CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subparagraph, taxes paid by any corporation eligible for the credit provided by section 936 to a possession of the United States shall be treated as a withholding tax paid with respect to any dividend paid by such corporation to the extent such taxes would be treated as paid by the corporation receiving the dividend under rules similar to the rules of

section 902 (and the amount of any such dividend shall be increased by the amount so treated).

**"(3) CERTAIN OTHER EARNINGS AND PROFITS ADJUSTMENTS.—**

**"(a) CONSTRUCTION PERIOD CARRYING CHARGES.—**The adjustments provided in section 312(n)(1) shall apply in the case of amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989.

**"(b) INTANGIBLE DRILLING COSTS.—**The adjustments provided in section 312(n)(2)(A) shall apply in the case of amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989.

**"(c) ORGANIZATIONAL EXPENDITURES.—**Section 248 shall not apply to expenditures paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989.

**"(d) LIFO INVENTORY ADJUSTMENTS.—**The adjustments provided in section 312(n)(4) shall apply.

**"(e) INSTALLMENT SALES.—**In the case of any installment sale in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989, alternative minimum taxable income shall be computed as if the corporation did not use the installment method. The preceding sentence shall not apply to the applicable percentage (as determined under section 453A(c)(4) of the gain from any installment sale with respect to which section 453A(a)(1) applies.

**"(4) DISALLOWANCE OF LOSS OF EXCHANGE OF DEBT POOLS.—**No loss shall be recognized on the exchange of any pool of debt obligations for another pool of debt obligations having substantially the same effective interest rates and maturities.

**"(5) ACQUISITION EXPENSES OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES.—**Acquisition expenses of life insurance companies shall be capitalized and amortized in accordance with the treatment generally required under generally accepted accounting principles as if this paragraph applied to all taxable years.

**"(6) DEPLETION.—**The allowance for depletion with respect to any property placed in service in a taxable year beginning after 1989 shall be cost depletion determined under section 611.

**"(7) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN OWNERSHIP CHANGES.—If—**

**(A)** there is an ownership change (within the meaning of section 382) after October 22, 1986, with respect to any corporation, and

**"(B)(i)** the aggregate adjusted bases of the assets of such corporation (immediately after the change) exceed

**"(ii)** the value of the stock of such corporation (as determined for purposes of section 382), properly adjusted for liabilities and other relevant items,

then the adjusted basis of each asset of such corporation as of such time shall be its proportionate share (determined on the basis of respective fair market values) of the amount referred to in subparagraph (B)(ii).

**"(8) MERCHANT MARINE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION FUNDS.—**In the case of a capital construction fund established under section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, (46 U.S.C. 1177)—

**"(A)** subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 7518(c)(1) (and the corresponding provisions of such section 607) shall not apply to—

**"(i)** any amount deposited in such fund after December 31, 1986, or

**"(ii)** any earnings (including gains and losses) after December 31, 1986, on amounts in such fund, and

**"(B)** no reduction in basis shall be made under section 7518(f) (or the corresponding

provisions of such section 607) with respect to the withdrawal from the fund of any amount to which subparagraph (A) applies.

For purposes of this paragraph, any withdrawal of deposits or earnings from the fund shall be treated as allocable first to deposits made before (and earnings received or accrued before) January 1, 1987.

**"(9) SPECIAL DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS NOT ALLOWED.—**The deduction determined under section 833(b) shall not be allowed.

**"(10) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN CORPORATIONS.—**This subsection shall not apply to any S corporation, regulated investment company, real estate investment trust, or REMIC."

**(3) TREATMENT OF CIRCULATION EXPENDITURES.—**

**(A)** Subsection (a) of section 56 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8) and by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

**"(7) CIRCULATION EXPENDITURES.—**The amount allowable as a deduction under section 173 in computing the regular tax for amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 1986 (or, in the case of a corporation, in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1989) shall be capitalized and amortized ratably over the 3-year period beginning with the taxable year in which the expenditures were made. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a personal holding company (as defined in section 542) shall not be treated as a corporation."

**(B)** Paragraph (2) of section 56(b) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

**"(2) RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL EXPENDITURES.—**The amount allowable as a deduction under section 174(a) in computing the regular tax for amounts paid or incurred after December 31, 1986, shall be capitalized and amortized ratably over the 10-year period beginning with the taxable year in which the expenditures were made."

**(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—**

**(1)** Paragraph (6) of section 56(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of a corporation to which subsection (c) applies, this paragraph shall not apply to installment sales in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989."

**(2)** Paragraph (8) of section 56(a) of such Code (as redesignated by subsection (b)(3)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

**"(8) ADJUSTED BASIS.—**The adjusted basis of any property with respect to which an adjustment under this section applies shall be determined by applying the treatment prescribed in this section."

**(3)** Paragraph (2) of section 56(a) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

**"(2) MINING EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENSES.—**With respect to each mine or other natural deposit (other than an oil, gas, or geothermal well) of the taxpayer, the amount allowable as a deduction under section 616(a) or 617(a) (determined without regard to section 291(b)) in computing the regular tax for costs paid or incurred after December 31, 1986, shall be capitalized and amortized ratably over the 10-year period beginning with the taxable year in which the expenditures were made."

**(4)** Paragraph (1) of section 57(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of a corporation to which section 56(c) applies, the preceding sentence shall not apply to any property placed in service in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1989."

**(5)** Paragraph (2) of section 57(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

**"(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CORPORATIONS.—**In the case of a corporation to which section 56(c) applies, this paragraph shall not apply to costs paid or incurred in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1989."

**(6)** Paragraph (5) of section 57(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

**"(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR CORPORATIONS.—**In the case of a corporation to which section 56(c) applies, this paragraph shall not apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989."

**(7)** Section 56 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (f).

**(8)** Paragraph (1) of section 59(a) of such Code is amended by inserting "and" at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking subparagraph (C), and by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

**(9)** Clause (ii) of section 53(d)(1)(B) of such Code is amended—

**(A)** by striking "subsections (b)(1) and (c)(3) of section 56" and inserting "(b)(1), (c)(1), (c)(2), (c)(7), and (c)(9) of section 56", and

**(B)** by striking the last sentence thereof.

**(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—**

**(1) IN GENERAL.—**Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989.

**(2) DEPRECIATION.—**The amendment made by subsection (b)(1) shall apply to property placed in service in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989; except that such amendment shall not apply to any property if the amendments made by section 201 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 do not apply to such property by reason of section 203, 204, or 251(d) of such Act.

## IN SUPPORT OF THE UNIFORM POLL CLOSING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the recent Easter break I, as chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, led a congressional delegation to east Africa between March 24 to April 8, to examine delivery of humanitarian assistance to famine victims in war-torn Sudan. The delegation met with leaders of the government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army, who are engaged in a civil war which has already resulted in the death of 250,000 civilians, mostly children.

I was absent from the House floor during consideration of House Resolution 117 on April 5, and subsequently not present to vote on H.R. 18, the uniform poll closing bill. This important legislation is needed to solve a serious problem with our Presidential elections. Since this country spans several time zones and encompasses States with widely varying poll closing times, voters, who know vote totals from places where the polls have closed, are discouraged from voting.

I stand in support of H.R. 18 and, therefore, would have voted for its passage had I been present. H.R. 18 would establish a nationwide uniform poll closing time in order to enhance voter turnout. This bill can be viewed as a



success even if only a dozen more of our Nation's voters cast their ballot and express their conscience.

#### POLITICS IN EL SALVADOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Net MOLLOHAN] is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker the recent Presidential election in El Salvador poses somewhat of a dilemma to interested observers in the United States. Alfredo Cristiani, candidate of the ARENA Party, enjoyed a surprisingly easy victory over the candidate of the ruling Christian Democratic Party.

As a member of the Presidential observer team sent to El Salvador to monitor the fairness of the election, my initial and most powerful impression is that the election was a testimonial to the courage of the Salvadoran people. Roughly one-half of eligible voters turned out to cast their ballots, despite the threats of guerrillas set on disrupting the democratic process. This is, by the way, an even more remarkable figure when one remembers that the last election in the United States was decided by barely one-half of all eligible voters—and we were not faced with the threat of terrorist attack.

El Salvador does not, of course, have a democratic tradition, and it was—for me at any rate—inspiring to witness the people's enthusiastic embrace of that most basic of political rights, the free ballot.

Mr. Speaker, virtually everyone in the United States agrees that this is the good news: Salvadorans have tasted democracy and they like it. To many Americans in and out of Congress, the bad news is the result of this new-found taste for democracy: the ARENA Party, despite their demonstrated skill at winning a democratic election, has never been closely associated with democratic precepts.

The newspapers have "linked"—this is an internationally imprecise verb; the exact relationship has never been identified—the party's founder, Roberto d'Aubuisson, to the rightwing death squads. The death squads, of course, are notorious for borrowing one of the guerrillas' favorite tactics of inflicting rather indiscriminate violence on the population. To this day, it is so common to read about the far-right ARENA Party that one could be excused for thinking that was the party's official name.

This apparent contradiction explains the ambivalence with which the election was received by many Central American-watchers in the State Department, in this Congress, and across the United States. They believe that the democratic process worked tre-

mendously well in El Salvador only to bring to power a party unworthy of that very process. The critics argue, in short, that an undemocratic party won a democratic election.

This is, philosophically, a difficult position for anyone who believes in democracy as a form of government. If you really believe that an undemocratic party can win a democratic election, you have to question at least one of the two basic tenets of democracy—

That the people truly want control over their government, and

That the people are in the best position to make judgments about their society and their government.

How can a true Democrat, in the United States, argue that ARENA should not have won the election? Why should they not have won it? It was a fair election. Over half of the population voted. Who are we in the United States to say that these voters made the wrong decision? Why, in short, is our judgment better than the Salvadoran people's judgment? The answer, of course, is that it is not.

I do not mean to be an apologist for the ARENA Party. I have tremendous respect for Jose Napoleon Duarte, the current President and leader of the moderate Christian Democrats. I do not take lightly the questions raised about Mr. d'Aubuisson's relationship with the death squads. I am concerned about putting the ARENA Party in power, and, frankly, I can understand those in the United States who wish to the Christian Democrats had won another term. But, they did not win another term, and, while I will not defend the ARENA Party's victory, I will defend the Salvadoran people's right to give them that victory.

Indeed, I think the Salvadoran people share with concerned democrats in the United States many of the same concerns about the ARENA Party. The Salvadorans, however, have a somewhat different perspective. They are in the middle of a civil war, a very bloody affair that has been going on for a decade now. For all of President Duarte's efforts, the war drags on, and the Salvadoran people saw the ARENA Party as an alternative. Perhaps they saw a vote for ARENA, given the party's history, as somewhat of a risk but a risk worth taking.

The people's decision to put ARENA in power is not an abdication of democratic responsibility; it is, instead, a reflection of their confidence in exercising that responsibility. The ARENA Party knows that. It will not forget that it owes its ascension to power to the votes of the people.

The Salvadorans—to a much greater extent even than those of us watching with interest from the United States—will be closely examining ARENA's actions in the coming months. Will Cristiani be independent of d'Aubuisson?

Has the new President chosen wisely the head of the armed forces? Who will the legislature, also controlled by ARENA, select as the country's judges? What will happen to the death squads? Will the killing be stepped up or reduced? The answers to these questions will tell those of us in the United States concerned about the election a great deal about ARENA's commitment to democracy. More important, it will tell the Salvadorans, who, I am convinced, intend to remain masters of their fate.

I think already we are getting a reassuringly clearer picture of the type of government Mr. Cristiani intends to head. Recently, for instance, he worked with the President of the Salvadoran Supreme Court to reinstate kidnapping charges against eight military officers and civilians closely associated with d'Aubuisson and the death squads. This was a decisive move that clearly signaled his independence from the radical elements of his party. While it is very premature to pass a final favorable judgment on the ARENA government, a sense of fairness, buttressed by the evidence of Mr. Cristiani's integrity we have seen thus far, demands that we take the new President at his word and offer him all appropriate support.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending, credit, and revenues for fiscal year 1989. This is the second report of the 101st Congress.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, credit authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

Current level reports are intended to provide Members information to compare enacted spending and revenues with the aggregate ceilings on budget authority, outlays, and revenues established in a budget resolution, and also to compare enacted legislation with the allocations of new discretionary budget authority, entitlement authority, and credit authority made to a committee pursuant to subsection 302(a) of the Budget Act. This report compares the spending, credit, and revenue levels in current level with those assumed in

the budget resolution for fiscal year 1989 (House Concurrent Resolution 268), adopted on June 6, 1988.

Current level reports provide information that is necessary for enforcing section 311 of the Budget Act. Section 311(a) prohibits the consideration of a spending or revenue measure if the adoption of that measure would cause the ceiling on total new budget authority or total outlays set in the budget resolution for a fiscal year to be exceeded or would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level of revenues set forth in the budget resolution.

Section 311(b) provides an exception to the 311(a) point of order for measures that would breach the ceilings on total spending set forth in the budget resolution but would not cause a committee to exceed its "appropriate allocation" of discretionary spending authority made pursuant to section 302(a) of the Budget Act. Such an exception was first provided by the budget resolution for fiscal year 1985 (House Concurrent Resolution 280, 98th Congress). The exception was made permanent by the amendments to the Budget Act included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings). This exception is intended to protect a committee that has stayed within its allocation of discretionary budget authority and new entitlement authority from points of order if the total spending ceilings have been breached for reasons outside of its control. For fiscal year 1989, the 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 268 were printed in House Report 100-662, June 1, 1988.

Section 311(c) of the Budget Act provides that, for purposes of enforcing section 311, the levels of new budget authority, entitlement authority, outlays, and revenues shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget. Current level reports represent partial fulfillment of this enforcement responsibility of the Budget Committee by providing both estimates of enacted aggregate spending and revenues, and, for purposes of determining the applicability of the section 311(b) exception, estimates of the relationship between the budgetary effect of enacted legislation within a committee's jurisdiction and the allocation of spending authority made to that committee.

The estimates in this report are based on economic and technical assumptions in place at the time of the adoption of the budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 268, on June 6, 1988. This is intended to protect committees which acted on the basis of the assumptions of the budget resolution from changes in economic and technical factors over which they have no control. Unless the Congress adopts a subsequent budget resolution for a fiscal year that alters the assumptions concerning legislative actions, committees should be able to expect that measures that conform with the budget resolution will not be subject to points of order for violation of the Budget Act. To do otherwise and base enforcement on constantly changing economic and technical estimates would seriously disrupt the legislative process, penalize committees that are unable to complete work on leg-

islation within a short period after adoption of a budget resolution, and undermine respect for budget enforcement procedures.

In addition to section 311, the Budget Act contains another point of order that requires Budget Committee estimates for enforcement. Section 302(f)(1) of the Budget Act prohibits the consideration of a measure providing new budget authority, new entitlement authority, or new credit authority if the adoption of that measure would cause a committee to exceed its allocation of new spending or credit authority made pursuant to subsection 302(b) of the Budget Act. The 302(b) allocation is a subdivision of the new spending, new entitlement, and new credit authority allocated to a committee pursuant to section 302(a), among either the subcommittee of that committee or among programs over which the committee has jurisdiction. This point of order was added to the Budget Act by the amendments included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Section 302(g) provides that the enforcement of section 302 shall be based on estimates of spending and credit authority made by the Committee on the Budget. The Budget Committee fulfills this responsibility by providing, as necessary, a separate section 302 status report to the Speaker.

For information purposes only, current level reports will continue to include a comparison of the budget and credit authority divided among the Appropriations subcommittees by that committee's 302(b) division with the actual enacted spending and credit legislation within each subcommittee's jurisdiction.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, April 5, 1989.

HON. JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR.,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending.

I am herewith transmitting the status report under House Concurrent Resolution 268, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1989.

In the House of Representatives, the procedural situation with regard to the spending ceilings (total budget authority and total outlays) is affected by section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended by Public Law 99-177. Enforcement against possible breaches of the spending ceilings under 311(a) of the Budget Act would not apply when a measure would not cause a committee to exceed its "appropriate allocation" of "new discretionary budget authority" or "new entitlement authority" made pursuant to Section 302(a) of the Budget Act. It should be noted that under this procedure the committee's outlay allocation is not considered.

The intent of section 311(b) of the Budget Act is to protect a committee that has stayed within its spending authority allocations—discretionary budget authority or new entitlement authority—from points of order if the total spending ceilings have

been breached for reasons outside of its control. The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 268 were printed in H. Rept. 100-662 (June 1, 1988).

The enclosed tables compare enacted legislation to each committee's 302(a) allocation of discretionary budget authority, new entitlement authority, new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments. The estimates of spending and revenues for purposes of the application of points of order under the Budget Act are based upon the economic and technical assumptions underlying the fiscal year 1989 budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 268.

The Energy and Commerce Committee and the Ways and Means Committee have exceeded their targets for new entitlement authority because of the enactment of Public Law 100-360, the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act and Public Law 100-485, the Family Welfare Reform Act. The concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1989 assumed enactment of both pieces of legislation but made no allocations for them. The House report on the Budget Resolution explained that such legislation, if deficit-neutral, would be appropriate even though it exceeded the resolution's section 302 allocations or spending aggregates.

Revenues exceed the revenue floor established by the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1989 because of enactment of Public Law 100-360, the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act and Public Law 100-485, the Family Welfare Reform Act. Passage of this legislation was assumed in the budget resolution but not reflected in the revenue floor. The budget resolution assumed deficit-neutral catastrophic health and welfare reform legislation, but not a specific dollar amount. As explained in the House report on the budget resolution, the revenue increases in Public Law 100-360 and Public Law 100-485 were intended to offset and make deficit neutral the multiyear spending in those bills. Therefore, it would not be consistent with the assumptions in the budget resolution to enact any additional revenue-losing legislation beyond Public Law 100-418, the Omnibus Trade Act and Public Law 100-449, the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.

Sincerely

LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1989 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 268—REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF APR. 4, 1989

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level	1,231,700	1,099,700	964,400
Current level	1,232,634	1,100,091	964,780
Amount under ceilings			
Amount over ceilings	934	391	
Amount under floor			
Amount over floor			34

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate of budget authority



for fiscal year 1989, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 268 to be exceeded.

## OUTLAYS

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate of outlays for fiscal 1989, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 268 to be exceeded.

## REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds \$34 million in revenues for fiscal year 1989, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 268.

**Fiscal Year 1989 Discretionary Action Budget Authority—Comparison of Current Level and Budget Resolution Allocation by Committee Pursuant to Sec. 302**

[In millions of dollars]		Current level
House Committee	budget authority	
Agriculture.....	(+412)	
Appropriations <sup>1</sup> .....	(+293)	
Armed Services.....		
Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.....		
District of Columbia.....		
Education and Labor.....		
Energy and Commerce.....		
Foreign Affairs.....		
Government Operations.....		
House Administration.....		
Interior and Insular Affairs.....		
Judiciary.....		
Merchant Marine and Fisheries.....		
Post Office and Civil Service.....		
Public Works and Transportation.....		
Science and Technology.....		
Small Business.....		
Veterans' Affairs.....	(-4)	
Ways and Means.....	(-79)	

Committees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(a) allocation for "discretionary action".

<sup>1</sup> See next table for detail.

**FISCAL YEAR 1989 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DISCRETIONARY ACTION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL AND BUDGET RESOLUTION SUBDIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 302**

[In millions of dollars]			
House Appropriations Subcommittee Subdivisions	Current level budget authority	Direct loans	Primary loan guarantees
Commerce, State, Justice.....	(+309)	(-3)	
Defense.....	(-224)		
District of Columbia.....	(-6)		
Energy and Water.....	(-47)	(+3)	
Foreign Operations.....		(-3,632)	
Interior.....			
Labor, HHS, Education.....	(+164)	(-33)	
Legislative Branch.....	(-41)		
Military Construction.....			
Rural Development and Agriculture..	(+14)	(-243)	(+6)
Transportation.....	(+98)		
Treasury, Postal Service.....	(+26)		
VA/HUD/Independent Agencies.....			
Total.....	+293	-3,908	+6

Subcommittees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(b) subdivisions of discretionary action.

**FISCAL YEAR 1989—ALLOCATION OF NEW ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY (NEA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 302**

[In millions of dollars]

Committee	Allocation	Reported <sup>1</sup>	Enacted <sup>2</sup>	Enacted over (+)/under (-) allocation
Agriculture.....		+611	+542	+542
Armed Services.....		+2,234	+2,234	+2,234
Energy and Commerce.....		+75	+55	+55
Interior and Insular Affairs.....		+35	+16	+16
Judiciary.....		+39	+14	+14
Veterans' Affairs.....	+408	+395	+389	-19
Ways and Means.....		+1,624	+1,461	+1,461
Undistributed to Committees.....	+125			

<sup>1</sup> These figures are used for 401(b)(2) of the Budget Act.

<sup>2</sup> These figures are used for 302(f) points of order.

Note.—The Energy and Commerce and the Ways and Means Committees have exceeded their targets because of the enactment of Public Law 100-360, the Medicare Catastrophic Act, and the completion of H.R. 1720, the Family Welfare Reform Act. The Fiscal Year 1989 Budget Resolution assumed enactment of such legislation but made no allocations for it. The House report on the Budget Resolution explained that such legislation, if deficit-neutral, would be appropriate even though it exceeded the Resolution's Section 302 allocations or spending aggregates.

Further, Public Law 100-418, the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act, provided \$111 million of NEA that is scored in the "enacted" column against the Ways and Means Committee Allocation. This amount can be counted against the undistributed \$125 million in NEA that was assumed by the Budget Conferees to be available for programs in functions 500, 550 and 600.

**U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, April 5, 1989.**

**HON. LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S.  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.**

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, estimated revenues, and direct and guaranteed loan levels in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the 1989 budget (H. Con. Res. 268). This report for fiscal year 1989 is tabulated as of close of business April 4, 1989. A summary of this tabulation is as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Current level	Budget Resolution H. Con. Res. 268	Current level +/- resolution
Budget authority.....	1,232,634	1,231,700	934
Outlays.....	1,100,091	1,099,700	391
Revenues.....	964,434	964,400	34
Direct loan obligations.....	24,370	28,300	-3,930
Guaranteed loan commitments.....	110,956	110,950	6

Since my last report, Congress completed action on Public Law 101-7, to adjust the purchase price for nonfat dry dairy products, changing outlay estimates for 1989.

Sincerely,

**ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,  
Director.**

**PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT 101ST CONG., 1ST  
SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1989  
AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS APR. 4, 1989**

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues.....			964,434

**PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT 101ST CONG., 1ST  
SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1989  
AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS APR. 4, 1989—Continued**

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Permanent appropriations and trust funds.....	855,280	708,311	
Other appropriations.....	594,475	609,315	
Offsetting receipts.....	-218,335	-218,335	
Total enacted in previous sessions.....	1,231,420	1,099,291	964,434
II. Enacted this session: Adjust the purchase price for nonfat dry dairy products (Public Law 101-7).....			-10
III. Continuing resolution authority.....			
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses.....			
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action:			
Dairy indemnity program.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	
Special milk.....	4		
Food Stamp Program.....	253		
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	144		
Compact of free association.....	1	1	
Federal unemployment benefits and allowances.....	31	31	
Worker training.....	32	32	
Special benefits.....	37	37	
Payments to the Farm Credit System.....	35	35	
Payment to the civil service retirement and disability trust fund.....	(85)	(85)	
Supplemental security income.....	201	201	
Special benefits for disabled coal miners.....	3		
Medicaid:			
Public Law 100-360.....	45	45	
Public Law 100-485.....	10	10	
Family Support Payments to States:			
Previous law.....	355	355	
Public Law 100-485.....	63	63	
Total entitlement authority.....	1,214	810	
Total current level as of Apr. 4, 1989.....	1,232,634	1,100,091	964,434
1989 budget resolution H. Con. Res. 268.....	1,231,700	1,099,700	964,400
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution.....	934	391	34
Under budget resolution.....			

<sup>1</sup> Less than \$500 thousand.

Notes.—Numbers may not add due to rounding.

**SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED**

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOAKLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MOLLOHAN, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ECKART) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 15 minutes, on April 12.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOLLOHAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, on April 12.

Mr. LELAND, for 60 minutes, on April 12.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOUGLAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mr. TAUKE.

Mr. LOWERY of California.

Ms. SCHNEIDER.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. MARLENEE.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOAKLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. AUCOIN in two instances.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. STARK in five instances.

Mr. BORSKI.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to designate April 1989 as "National Recycling Month;"

H.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution designating April 23, 1989, through April 29, 1989, and April 23, 1990, through April 29, 1990, as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week;" and

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to designate April 16, 1989, and April 6, 1990, as "Education Day, U.S.A."

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 666. An act to allow an obsolete Navy drydock to be transferred to the city of Jacksonville, FL, before the expiration of the otherwise applicable 60-day congressional review period.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 12, 1989, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

958. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Morris Berthold Abram, of New York, Representative of the United States of America-designate to the European Office of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

959. A letter from the Executive Director, Board for International Broadcasting, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for carrying out that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

960. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's report on its activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

961. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, transmitting copy of report to the President and the Congress 1988, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 470(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

962. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

963. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

964. A letter from the FSM Representative to the United States, Government of the Federated States of Micronesia, transmitting the first annual report of the Federated States of Micronesia on the use and expenditure of funds made available under the Compact of Free Association, pursuant to 48 U.S.C. 1681 nt.; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PEPPER: House Resolution 126. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1487, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for the Department of State, and for other purposes. (Rept. 101-22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 1750. A bill to implement the Bipartisan Accord on Central America of March 24, 1989. (Rept. 101-23, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 1761. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the application of the minimum tax in the case of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORIO (for himself, Mr.

ECKART, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SIKORSKI):

H.R. 1762. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act and related laws to improve the performance of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, to authorize appropriations for that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DYSON (for himself, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 1763. A bill to authorize expenditures for fiscal year 1990 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself and Mr. McDADE):

H.R. 1764. A bill to make technical corrections to the Business Opportunity Development Reform Act of 1988; to the Committee on Small Business.

H.R. 1765. A bill to make technical corrections to the Business Opportunity Development Reform Act of 1988; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MILLER of Washington (for himself and Mr. CHANDLER):

H.R. 1766. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain luggage frames of aluminum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.R. 1767. A bill to ensure the right of international travel, to authorize the President to regulate transactions incident to travel to or from countries to which travel is restricted under the Passport Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLAZ:

H.R. 1768. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on certain knitwear fabricated in Guam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MFUME (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE of



New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1769. A bill to establish a Minority Business Development Administration in the Department of Commerce, to clarify the relationship between such Administration and the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Small Business and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Colorado:

H.R. 1770. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on carfentanil citrate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUECHNER (for himself, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 1771. A bill to deny discretionary project funds to States that voluntarily reduce the period of availability of interstate highway construction funds for any fiscal year; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 1772. A bill to prohibit the importation of motor vehicles from Yugoslavia until the government of that country affords its workers internationally recognized worker rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 1773. A bill to establish domestic content requirements for motor vehicles sold or distributed in interstate commerce in the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUSTAMANTE (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 1774. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program for the prevention and control of diabetes and related complications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 1775. A bill to assist the Coast Guard in verifying information on applications and renewals for certain commercial vessel licenses and certificates; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Florida):

H.R. 1776. A bill to provide for a nationally coordinated program of research, promotion, and consumer information regarding limes that is designed to expand domestic and foreign markets for limes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 1777. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on in-line roller skate boots; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 10-percent tax credit for investments in certain Central American democracies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 1779. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on crude feathers and down; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONTZ:

H.R. 1780. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the eligibility for out-

patient medical services furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO (for himself and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 1781. A bill to prohibit vessels transporting Alaskan oil from using routes through the territorial and international waters northward of the Santa Barbara Channel Islands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H.R. 1782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit taxpayers to elect to pay tax shown on return in installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 1783. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to low fuming brazing rods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA:

H.R. 1784. A bill relating to certain contributions required to be made under the retirement provisions of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 1785. A bill to amend the Foreign Trades Zones Act to renew the existing customs exemption applicable to bicycle parts not reexported in foreign trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RINALDO (for himself) (by request) Mr. LENT, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1786. A bill to amend the Trust Indenture Act of 1939; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAWYER (for himself, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. POSHARD):

H.R. 1787. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act to establish priorities for State distribution of vocational education funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend the Carol D. Perkins Vocational Education Act to clarify the administration of and use of funds under the program for single parents and homemakers and the sex equity program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1789. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on D Salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1790. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on anis base; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1791. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on naphthol AS types; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1792. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on theobromine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1793. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on chlorhexanone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1794. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Broenner's acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1795. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Neville and Winter's acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 1796. A bill to provide for a General Accounting Office study of the National Endowment for Democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1797. A bill to provide for a study and report concerning sexual harassment of

women at the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1798. A bill to limit the obligation and expenditure of funds appropriated for the Board for International Broadcasting unless such funds are appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1799. A bill concerning reform in budget decisionmaking procedures of the United Nations and its specialized agencies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1800. A bill to establish a program for the training at the University of Maine and in Washington, District of Columbia, of media personnel from certain developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1801. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the private activity bond volume cap for States which do not make medical assistance available for Medicare cost-sharing for qualified Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1802. A bill to provide compensation for loss of use of, and improvements to, certain lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to designate the month of April, 1989, as "National Cancer Awareness Month;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. UNSOELD (for herself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. BOSCO, and Mr. MANTON):

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President should use full authority to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit Importation of fishery products from countries which fail to enter into and implement adequate driftnet monitoring and enforcement agreements; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Ways and Means.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

60. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to the Civilian Conservation Corps and Work Projects Administration programs; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. FASCELL introduced a bill (H.R. 1803) to permit issuance of a certificate of documentation for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel the *African Queen*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. MURPHY.  
H.R. 21: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. OBERSTAR.  
H.R. 22: Mr. MORRISON of Washington.  
H.R. 29: Mr. JAMES.  
H.R. 46: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.  
H.R. 53: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 91: Mr. BLAZ and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 109: Mr. JACOBS.  
H.R. 112: Mr. LAUGHLIN.  
H.R. 117: Ms. SCHNEIDER.  
H.R. 128: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.  
H.R. 126: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. DE LUGO.  
H.R. 128: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. SAVAGE.  
H.R. 129: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BATES, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. WEISS.  
H.R. 133: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.  
H.R. 134: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FROST, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.  
H.R. 135: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BATES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. WEISS.  
H.R. 136: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 141: Mr. DIXON, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. RIDGE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 156: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
H.R. 211: Ms. SCHNEIDER and Mr. BOUCHER.  
H.R. 214: Mr. BATEMAN.  
H.R. 215: Mrs. SAIKI and Mr. BENNETT.  
H.R. 237: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. MARKEY.  
H.R. 243: Mr. BALLENGER.  
H.R. 245: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MARTINEZ.  
H.R. 286: Mr. SUNDQUIST.  
H.R. 423: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. BUECHNER.  
H.R. 537: Mr. KANJORSKI.  
H.R. 635: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.  
H.R. 673: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DYSON, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. STANGELAND.  
H.R. 679: Mr. WEISS.  
H.R. 720: Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. BOUCHER.  
H.R. 746: Mr. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 766: Mr. WHEAT and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 772: Mr. SARPALIUS and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.  
H.R. 833: Mr. BERMAN.  
H.R. 874: Mr. KAPTUR, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 901: Mr. SMITH of Florida.  
H.R. 917: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. HUBBARD.  
H.R. 930: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SWIFT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. CARDIN.  
H.R. 995: Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 1055: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FAWELL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. BARNARD.  
H.R. 1074: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. OLIN.  
H.R. 1086: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. DAVIS.  
H.R. 1091: Mr. McDade.  
H.R. 1095: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HANCOCK, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH.  
H.R. 1134: Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. RUSSO.  
H.R. 1170: Mr. CARPER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. GUNDERSON.  
H.R. 1176: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. ATKINS.  
H.R. 1179: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. FROST.  
H.R. 1180: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LELAND, and Mrs. UNSOELD.  
H.R. 1190: Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 1200: Mr. PENNY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. McDade, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ECKART, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. TOWNS.  
H.R. 1358: Mr. SANGMEISTER.  
H.R. 1401: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PENNY.  
H.R. 1416: Mr. MARKEY.  
H.R. 1423: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.  
H.R. 1425: Mr. WEISS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
H.R. 1453: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. BATES.  
H.R. 1465: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. DINGELL.  
H.R. 1515: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. SARPALIUS.  
H.R. 1525: Mr. HORTON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MILLER of California.  
H.R. 1574: Mr. DORNAN of California, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ATKINS, and Mrs. MORELLA.  
H.R. 1605: Mr. MINETA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 1609: Mr. COOPER.  
H.R. 1618: Mr. SAVAGE.  
H.R. 1644: Mr. BUECHNER.  
H.R. 1677: Mr. MANTON.  
H.R. 1704: Mr. BEILSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SABO, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.  
H.J. Res. 34: Mr. LIVINGSTON.  
H.J. Res. 54: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.J. Res. 68: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HILER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. WILSON.  
H.J. Res. 74: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. COUGHLIN.  
H.J. Res. 136: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PARKER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.  
H.J. Res. 164: Mr. FROST, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. McEWEN.  
H.J. Res. 178: Mr. ATKINS and Mr. HYDE.  
H.J. Res. 185: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BATES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HILER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. FAZIO.  
H.J. Res. 194: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. STARK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. DYSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.J. Res. 214: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FROST, and Mr. McEWEN.  
H.J. Res. 228: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BATES, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ERDBREICH, Mr.



EVANS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. SWIFT.

H. CON. RES. 40: Mr. SIKORSKI.  
H. RES. 18: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BLILEY.

H. RES. 122: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. FRENZEL.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

#### H.R. 1487

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—Page 20, after line 5, insert the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

#### SEC. 133. REPORTS ON REFORMS IN NICARAGUA.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORTS.—The Secretary of State shall report to the Congress each month on the extent to which the Government of Nicaragua is undertaking the reforms which are necessary in order for that Government to comply with the pledge which it made in the Guatemala Peace Accord of August 7, 1987, "to promote an authentic democratic, pluralist and participatory process that includes the promotion of social justice [and] respect for human rights".

(b) SPECIFIC REFORMS TO BE DISCUSSED.—Each report pursuant to this section shall discuss the extent to which the Government of Nicaragua has undertaken each of the following reforms in order to bring about lasting peace, pluralism, and democracy in Nicaragua:

#### (1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) Ensure freedoms of expression, association, assembly and movement, religion, and education.

(B) Restore rights to security of person and home and freedom from unjustified arrest.

(C) Stop coercive pressure to join Sandinista party groups.

(D) Stop discriminatory and punitive application of military conscription.

(E) Allow all citizens, including refugees and exiles, to return to Nicaragua.

(F) Reinstate due process and fair trials and release those imprisoned without charge, trial, or due process, including campesinos, Creoles, and Indians.

(G) Abolish extraordinary tribunals and the powers of police forces to conduct trials, decide appeals, and sentence individuals to prison terms.

(H) Permit independent human rights observers, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, to meet and travel freely and to visit prisoners, prisons, and tribunals.

(I) End all forms of torture and conditions of confinement which constitute torture and end the practice of holding prisoners incommunicado.

#### (2) POLITICAL PROCESS REFORMS.—

(A) Allow political parties and the democratic opposition to meet and march publicly, publicize meetings, and meet with and utilize the media.

(B) End jailing of opposition party activists and the drafting of opposition party activities and their children in reprisal for non-violent political activity.

(C) Abolish the role of the Committees for the Defense of Sandinismo's (CDS) and other party organizations in dispensing rationing cards and government services.

(D) Conduct free and open presidential, legislative, and municipal elections by De-

cember 31, 1990, as specified by current Nicaraguan law.

(E) Repeal the suspension provisions of the Nicaraguan constitution.

(F) Separate the armed forces from any political party.

#### (3) PRESS AND MEDIA RIGHTS.—

(A) Allow an uncensored, free press.

(B) End newsprint restrictions and allow private newsprint sales.

(C) Allow the full spectrum of private television and radio broadcasting.

#### (4) LABOR RIGHTS.—

(A) Ensure the right to strike and to publish by independent unions.

(B) Release those imprisoned because of non-violent union activities.

#### (5) RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS.—

(A) Allow the Catholic church to reopen its social welfare, human rights, and publication offices.

(B) Allow Cardinal Obando Y Bravo to resume his televised Sunday mass.

(C) Allow the return of all expelled Catholic priests.

(D) Allow religion courses to be taught in private schools.

(E) Allow Protestant evangelicals to preach and conduct meetings.

#### (6) CAMPESINO RIGHTS.—

(A) End preventive detention and forcible resettlement of campesinos and allow those who have been displaced to return.

(B) Cease aerial bombing attacks against civilians and their properties.

(C) Cease the destruction of peasant farmlands.

(D) End pressure to join Sandinista farming cooperatives.

#### (7) INDIAN AND CREOLE RIGHTS.—

(A) Permit Indian and Creole residents to freely travel, assemble, speak, publish, broadcast, and maintain cultural beliefs and practices.

(B) End forcible detention and relocation of Indian and Creole residents and allow them to return to their home communities.

(C) Cease aerial bombings and attacks on Atlantic Coast civilians and their properties.

(D) Allow Indians and Creoles to engage in traditional farming, fishing, hunting, and necessary subsistence activity.